National Anti-Slavery Standard.

S. H. GAY, OLIVER JOHNSON, } ..... Editors.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, Corresponding Editor.

VOL. XIV. NO. 22. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1853. WHOLE NO. 698.

Published weekly, on Saturday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. TERMS, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Selections.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE U. STATES.

DISTRICT OF OHIO.

Before Mr. Justice M'Lean.

HENRY MILLER *vs.* GEORGE W. QUERRY.

[Reported by Mr. Justice M'Lean.]

Fugitive Slave Law—Constitutional Law—Trial by Jury—Presumption of Freedom.

Slavery is a municipal regulation; is local, and cannot exist without the authority of law. But it need not be shown that it is created by express enactment. It may arise from long recognised rights, countervened by no legislative action. African Slavery is, thus recognised in Kentucky, and the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, whose jurisdiction is coextensive with the country, are bound to take judicial notice of its existence in those States where it prevails.

The Constitution of the United States did not leave the enforcement of the provision for the reclamation of slaves with the States. It vested that power in the Government of the United States. This doctrine was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the U. States in Prigg *vs.* Pennsylvania, 16 Peters, 539; has been denied by no respectable State court, and has been sustained by the action of the legislative department of the Government.

In proceedings under the Fugitive Slave Law, the inquiry is not strictly whether the fugitive be a slave or a freeman, but whether he owe service to the claimant. The decision, upon that question, is no bar to an inquiry, in the proper tribunal, as to the personal status of the fugitive. The examination is preliminary, and not a final adjudication.

The seventh amendment to the Constitution, preserving the right of trial by jury in all suits at common law, where the value in controversy exceeds twenty dollars, does not apply to an examination as to the claim for services under this law. Such an examination is not a proceeding at common law, but a statutory one.

The presumption of freedom attaches to every resident of a free State, without regard to colour; and on the same principle, in a slave State, every coloured man is presumed to be a slave.

It is not necessary, under the act of 1850, to produce the record showing the status of the fugitive in another State. The fact that he owes service may be established by other, and oral, testimony.

An affidavit being made on the 16th day of August, 1853, that George W. Querry was illegally imprisoned, he was brought before Judge McLean, that the cause of his detention might be inquired into.

The plaintiff, as above stated, objected to the discharge of Querry, on the ground that he was held by him as a fugitive from labour. After the evidence was heard, and the facts relied on by the defendant's counsel were admitted by the plaintiff; and after the counsel on both sides had argued the facts and the law of the case, the Judge proceeded to give his opinion.

After stating how the cause came before him, he observed, "The right of the claimant to the services of the defendant is the first point to be examined. If the claim, as made, has been proved, then the detention is not illegal.

Jacob Miller, the son of the claimant, was first examined. He is twenty-one years of age. His father resides in Washington county, Kentucky. He has known the fugitive ever since he can remember, as the slave of his father. A little more than four years ago he absconded from the service of his father, in company with three others, who were also the slaves of his father. The mother of the fugitive came to his father through the mother of the witness. The fugitives were advertised shortly after they absconded, and a reward of four hundred dollars was offered for their return. They were pursued by different persons, but were not overtaken. One of them was arrested at Louisville, and returned; but shortly after, he again absconded.

When Wash., as the fugitive was generally called, was lately arrested at Troy, in Ohio, he said nothing about being free, but observed that he had no intention to run off an hour before he started; that he was persuaded to do so by Steve, one of the individuals who accompanied him.

William Kelly—Is twenty-three years old, lives in the same county of Washington, within two and a half miles of the claimant, and for nine or ten years has known Wash. to be the servant of the claimant. He lived with the complainant as his other slaves, and was subject to his control. He ran away from his master better than four years ago. Was present when Wash. was arrested near Troy, a day or two ago. Wash., at first, did not recognise him; but did so after a little conversation. He told the witness that he was sorry he left Kentucky; did not intend to go an hour before he left, and that he was persuaded to leave by Steve.

James Kelly—Aged twenty-eight years, is brother of the above witness. Has known Wash. eleven years as the slave of the claimant. He corroborates the statement of the preceding witness as to the absconding of Wash., that he was advertised, admitted the right of his master, as stated by the other witnesses.

Isaiah Yoker—Lives in the same county, has known Wash., as the slave of the complainant twelve or thirteen years. He corroborates the other statements made by the witnesses examined before him.

Mr. Trader—Is a deputy marshal, and resides at Dayton. He arrested the fugitive, who said that the claimant was his master, and that he had always been well treated.

Mr. Black—Is also a deputy marshal. He heard Wash. say that the claimant was his master, and that he had been well treated; that he had been persuaded to run away.

As a matter against the right of the claimant, it is admitted that the defendant has resided four years in Ohio, and conducted himself well, being considered as a free man.

From the facts proved, there can be no doubt that the fugitive, under the laws of Kentucky, is the slave of the claimant, and that he absconded from his service a little more than four years ago. The testimony is clear on this point. No attempt has been made to controvert the facts, or to impeach the credibility of the witnesses. Of the many cases my judicial duties have required me to examine, where damages were claimed for aiding the escape of fugitives from labour, no case has been proved with more distinctness and fulness than this one. No one capable of comprehending evidence can doubt that the fugitive lived with the claimant, as his slave, for many years, and that he left that service, without the leave of his master, several years ago.

No proof, it is contended, has been offered to show that Kentucky is a State in which Slavery is authorised by law; and a discussion in the Senate of the United States is referred to, in which certain Senators declared that there was no law in the South expressly establishing Slavery. It is with regret that I hear this argument relied on in this case. It was used by gentlemen of the South, to justify the introduction of Slavery into our Territories without the authority of law. In Groves *vs* Slaughter, a Mississippi case, reported in 15 Peter's R., 450, the Supreme Court of the United States declared that Slavery was local, and that it could not exist without the authority of law; that it was a municipal regulation.

Whether this law was founded upon usage or express enactment, is of no importance. Usage of long continuance—so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary—has the force of law. It arises from long recognised rights, countervened by no legislative action. This is the source of many of the principles of the common law. And this for a century or more may constitute Slavery, though it be opposed, as it is, to all the principles of the common law of England. I speak of African Slavery.

But such a law can only acquire potency by long usage. Now, it may be admitted that in some of the Southern States, perhaps all of them, there cannot be found a statute which contains the words, "And be it enacted that Slavery shall exist;" and this was what was denied in the Senate. But this does not shake the decision of the Supreme Court, above referred to. Usage, of great antiquity, acquires the force of law. The denial, therefore, that Slavery existed by virtue of an express law, or by statute law, which was intended to be denied, was no denial at all. But no usage can acquire the force of law, except it has been long recognised as the basis of action, and as the principle on which the rights of property are maintained.

There is no slave State where the existence of Slavery is not recognised and maintained by numerous statutes and judicial decisions. The statute-books of the South are full of such enactments. The relation of master and slave is fully recognised, and, to some extent, regulated. The decision of the Supreme Court, above referred to, settles a most important principle; and I have no regrets that I was the means of inducing that decision.

It gives the proper limitation to Slavery. It cannot be extended beyond the jurisidiction of the States sanctioning it, and cannot legally be affected by the legislative action of any free State. The principle, I believe, was sanctioned by the Southern States, and was not controverted by any non-slaveholding State. On the question of Slavery in our Territories, this doctrine was first departed from.

The Supreme Court has long since held that that court and its judges recognise, without proof, the laws of the several States or Territories. The jurisdiction for that court, and of its members, extends throughout the Union. In the respective States they administer the local laws, so that the laws of the States come under their special cognizance in acting upon individual rights.

Kentucky is a slave State. Except in regard to land titles, no other subject has been more productive of legal controversy than contracts arising out of Slavery.

It is contended that the law authorising the reclamation of fugitives from labour is unconstitutional; that the Constitution left the power with the States, and vested no power on the subject in the Federal Government.

This argument has been sometimes advanced, and it may have been introduced into one or more political platforms. In regard to the soundness of this position, I will first refer to judicial decisions. In the case of Prigg *vs* The State of Pennsylvania, 16 Peter's R., 539, the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, without a dissenting voice, affirmed the doctrine that this power was in the Federal Government. A majority of them held that it was exclusively in the General Government. Some of the Judges thought that a State might legislate in aid of the act of Congress; but it was held by no one of them that the power could be exercised by a State, except in subordination to the Federal power.

Every State court which has decided the question, has decided it in accordance with the view of the Supreme Court. No respectable court, it is believed, has sustained the view that the power is with the State. Such an array of authority can scarcely be found in favour of the construction of any part of the Constitution which has ever been doubted. But this construction, sanctioned as it is by the entire judicial power—State as well as Federal—has also the sanction of the legislative power.

The Constitution of the United States, it will be observed, was formed in 1787. Afterward it was submitted to the respective States, for their ratification. The subject was not only largely discussed, in the Federal Convention, but also in every State Convention. No question has ever arisen, in regard to our federal relations, which was of equal importance to that of the adoption of the Constitution; none in our political history was more thoroughly discussed. The men of that day may be emphatically said to have understood the Constitution.

In a very few years after the Constitution was adopted by the States, the Fugitive Act of 1793 was passed. That law is still in force, except where the act of 1850 contains repugnant provisions. In the Congress which enacted the act of 1793, it is believed that some of the members had been members of the Convention. They could not have been ignorant of the provisions of that instrument; and by the passage of that act they exercised the power as one that belonged to the Federal Government. Here is a force of authority, judicial and legislative, which cannot be found on my other seriously litigated point in the Constitution.

Such a weight of authority is not to be shaken. If the question is not to be considered authoritatively settled, what part of that instrument can ever be settled? The surrender of fugitive slaves was a matter deeply interesting to the slave States. Under the Confederation there was no provision for their surrender. On the principles of comity amongst the States, the fugitives were delivered up; at other times they were protected and defended. This state of things produced uneasiness and discontent in the slave States. A remedy of this evil, as it was called, was provided in the Constitution.

An individual who puts his opinion, as to the exercise of this power, against the authority of the nation in its legislative and judicial action, must have no small degree of confidence in his own judgment. A few individuals in Massachusetts may have maintained, at one time, that the power was with the States; but such views were, it is believed, long since abandoned, but they are reasserted now more as a matter of expediency than of principle.

But whether we look at the weight of authority against State power, as asserted, or at the constitutional provision, we are led to the same result. The provision reads: "No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service may be due."

This, in the first place, is a Federal measure. It was adopted by the National Convention, and was sanctioned as a Federal law by the respective States. It is the supreme law of the land. Now, a provision which cannot be enforced, and which has no penalty for its violation, is no law. The highly respectable gentleman who read an ingenious argument in support of these views, is too good a theologian to contend that any rule of action which may be disregarded without incurring a penalty, can be a law. This was the great objection to the Articles of Confederation. There was no power to enforce its provisions. They were recommendatory, and without sanctions.

There is no regulation, divine or human, which can be called a law, without a sanction. Our first parents, in the garden, felt the truth of this; and it has been felt by violators of the divine or human laws throughout the history of our race.

The provision in the Constitution is prohibitory and positive. It prohibits the States from liberating slaves which escape into them, and it enjoins a duty to deliver up such fugitives, on claim being made. The Constitution vests no special power in Congress to prohibit the first, or to enforce the observance of the second. Does it, therefore, follow that effect can be given to neither, if a State shall disregard it?

Suppose a State declare a slave who escapes into it shall be liberated, or that any one who shall assist in delivering him up shall be punished. If this power belongs to the States, and not to the Federal Government, these regulations would be legal, as within the exercise of their discretion. This is not an ideal case. The principle was involved in the Prigg case, and the Supreme Court held the act of the State unconstitutional and void.

It is admitted that there is no power in the Federal Government to force any legislative action on a State. But if the Constitution guaranties a right to the master of a slave, and that he shall be delivered up, the power is given to effectuate that right. If this be not so, the Constitution is not what its framers supposed it to be. It was believed to be a fundamental law of the Union—a Federal law—a law to the States, and to the people of the States. It says that the States shall not do certain things. Is this the form of giving advice or recommendation? It is the language of authority, to those who are bound to obey. If a State do the thing forbidden, its act will be declared void. If it refuse to do that which is enjoined, the Federal Government, *being a government*, has the means of executing it.

The Constitution provides "that full faith shall be given to public acts, records, and judicial proceedings," of one State, in every other. If an individual claim this provision as a right, and a State court shall deny it, on a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the Union such judgment would be reversed. And so the provision that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Congress unquestionably may provide in what manner a right claimed under this clause, and denied by a State, may be enforced. And if a case can be raised under it, without any further statutory provisions, so as to present the point to the Supreme Court, the decision of a State court, denying the right, would be reversed. So a State is prohibited from passing a law that shall impair the obligations of a contract. Such a law the Supreme Court has declared void. In these cases, and in many others where a State is prohibited from doing a thing, the remedy is given by a writ of error, under the legislation of Congress. The same principle applies in regard to fugitives from labour.

A fugitive from justice may be delivered up under a similar provision in the Constitution. It declares that "a person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime." This is contained in the same section as the clause in relation to fugitives from labour, and they both stand upon the same principle. In both cases Congress has provided a mode in which effect shall be given to the provision. No one, it is believed, has doubted the constitutionality of the provision in regard to fugitives from justice.

The men who framed the Constitution were adequate to the great duties which devolved upon them. They knew that a General Government was essential to preserve the fruits of the Revolution. They understood the necessities of the country. The Articles of Confederation had been found as a rope of sand, in all matters of conflict between the different States, and the people of the different States. Without a General Government, commerce could not be regulated among the States, or with foreign nations; fugitives from labour could not be reclaimed; State boundaries could not be authoritatively established.

I am aware it has been stated that the subject of Slavery was not discussed in the Convention, and that the reclamation of fugitives from labour was not, at that time, a subject of much interest. This is a mistake. It was a subject of deep and exciting interest, and without a provision on the subject, no Constitution could have been adopted. I speak from information received from the late Chief Justice Marshall, who was one of the chief actors in that day, than whom no man then living was of higher authority.

The want of a general regulation on the subject of fugitives from justice and from labour was felt, and the above provisions in the Constitution were intended as a remedy. It has proved to be an adequate remedy, as against fugitives from justice. In no instance, it is believed, has the constitutionality of this provision been doubted. But the provision in relation to fugitives from labour, resting upon the same principle, is now opposed.

If the introduction of this provision into the fundamental law of the Union was not intended to operate as the law of the Union—if it was recommendatory in its character only—it was useless. The power to surrender fugitives from labour, under the Confederacy, was with each State. It could be done, or refused, at the discretion of the State. Did the framers of the Constitution intend to leave this matter as it was under the Confederation? The provision introduced shows an intention to make some provision on the subject. But by the argument, it is said, the provision made left the power with the States, and did not vest it in the General Government. The answer to this is, it was in the States before the provision, and, on this view, it added nothing to the power of the States. If such be the true construction of the provision, it fixes an act of consummate folly on the framers of the Constitution, and on the members of the State Conventions who adopted it. In laying the foundation of a General Government, they incorporated into the fundamental law a useless provision, and omitted to provide for an emergency which was felt and complained of in one-half of the States. The men of that day were not likely to be guilty of such an omission. They understood the Federal and State powers too well, not to know that without some effective provision on this subject the superstructure which they were about to rear would soon be overthrown. These were the circumstances under which the Constitution was framed and adopted. With the abstract principles of Slavery, courts called to administer the law have nothing to do. It is for the people, who are sovereign, and their representatives, in making constitutions, and in the enactment of laws, to consider the laws of Nature, and the immutable principles of right. This is a field which judges cannot explore. Their action is limited to conventional rights. They look to the law, and to the law only. A disregard of this, by the judicial powers, would undermine and overturn the social compact. If the law be injudicious or oppressive, let it be repealed or modified. But this is a power which the judiciary cannot reach.

The citizen of a slave State has a right, under the Constitution and laws of the Union, to have his fugitive slave "delivered up on claim being made," and no State can defeat or obstruct this constitutional right. The judicial power of the Union has the primary or eventual power to determine all rights arising under the Constitution. This will not be controverted by any legal mind, which has properly investigated the great principles of the Constitution. And the question now made is not, in principle, different from a numerous class of cases arising under powers prohibited to the States.

The worthy and estimable gentleman who read an argument on this occasion, in commenting on the cases covered by the Fugitive Law, embraced all cases of contract, and even that between a minister and his congregation. He supposes, if the minister should leave his congregation before his stipulated engagement had transpired, that he was liable to be arrested and returned to his congregation under the Fugitive Law.

This is a case, under this law, which no one before has supposed to be embraced by it. And if the law did cover such a case, it would be the most difficult to carry out of any other which has been imagined. If the minister could be returned, neither the court nor the congregation could compel him to preach. No profession or class of men could be less likely to do anything on *compulsion*.

But the law applies to no case of contract where the parties to the agreement are capable of making a contract, the remedy for a breach of which is by action at law. In the case of slaves and of apprentices, there is no remedy against the individual who absconds, by an action.

Various objections are stated to the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. The duties of the commissioners, the penalties inflicted, the bribe secured to the commissioner for remanding the fugitive, are all objected to as oppressive and unconstitutional. In regard to the five dollars in addition, paid to the commissioner, where the fugitive is remanded to the claimant, in all fairness, it cannot be considered as a bribe, or as so intended by Congress, but as a compensation to the commissioner for making a statement of the case, which includes the facts proved, and to which his certificate is annexed. In cases where the witnesses are numerous, and the investigation takes up several days, five dollars would scarcely be a compensation for the statement required. Where the fugitive is discharged, no statement is necessary.

The powers of the commissioner, or the amount of the penalties of the act, are not involved in this inquiry. If there be an unconstitutional provision in an act, that does not affect any other part of the act. But I by no means intimate that any part of the act referred to is in conflict with the Constitution. I only say that the objections made to it do not belong to the case under consideration.

The act of 1850, except by repugnant provisions, did not repeal the act of 1793. The objection that no jury is given does apply to both acts. From my experience in trying numerous actions for damages against persons who obstructed an arrest of fugitives from labour, or aided in their escape, I am authorised to say that the rights of the master would be safe before a jury. I recollect an instance where a strong Anti-Slavery man, called an Abolitionist, was on the jury in a case for damages, but who, being sworn to find as the evidence and the law required, agreed to a verdict for the plaintiff. He rightly determined that his own opinions could not govern him in deciding a controversy between parties, but that under his oath he was bound by the law and the evidence of the case.

It was in the power of Congress to give a jury in cases like the present, but the law contains no such provision, and the question raised is, whether the act without it is constitutional.

This question has been largely discussed in Congress, in the public press, and in conventions of the people. It is not here raised as a question of expediency or policy, but of power. In that aspect only is it to be considered.

The act of 1793 has been in operation about sixty years. During that whole time it has been executed as occasion required, and it is not known that any court, judge, or other officer, has held the act, in this or any other respect, unconstitutional. This long course of decision, on a question so exciting as to call forth the sympathies of the people and the astuteness of lawyers, is no unsatisfactory evidence that the construction is correct.

Under the Constitution and act of Congress, the inquiry is not strictly whether the fugitive be a slave or a freeman, but whether he owe service to the claimant. This would be the precise question in the case of an apprentice. In such a case the inquiry would not be, whether the master had treated the apprentice so badly as to entitle him to his discharge. Such a question would more properly arise under the indenture of apprenticeship, and the laws under which it was executed. And if the apprentice be remanded to the service of his master, it would in no respect affect his right to a discharge, where he is held, for the cruelty of his master or on any other ground.

The same principle applies to fugitives from labour. It is true in such cases evidence is heard that he is a freeman. His freedom may be established, by acts done or suffered by his master, not necessarily within the jurisdiction where he is held as a slave. Such an inquiry may be made, as it is required by the justice of the case. But on whatever ground the fugitive may be remanded, it cannot legally operate against his right to liberty. That right, when presented to a court in a slave State, has generally been acted upon with fairness and impartiality. Exceptions to this, if there be exceptions, would seem to have arisen on the claims of heirs or creditors, which are governed by local laws, with which the people of the other States are not presumed to be acquainted.

If a fugitive from labour, after being liberated by a judge or commissioner, should voluntarily return to his master, Southern courts have held that his original status would attach to him; he would be held as a slave. And, of course, the decision of the judge or commissioner, having been that he did not owe service to the claimant, could not operate as a bar to the rights of the master. The claim to freedom, if made, in the slave State, would be unaffected by the preliminary inquiry and decision. That decision is, that the slave does, or does not finally establish the fact, whether the fugitive is a freeman or a slave. If the decision on such an inquiry as this should finally fix the seal of Slavery on the fugitive, I should hesitate long, notwithstanding the weight of precedent, without the aid of a jury, to pronounce his fate. But the inquiry is preliminary, and not final.

It is true it may be said that the power of the master may be so exercised as to defeat a trial for the freedom of the fugitive. This must be admitted, but the hardship and injustice supposed arises out of the institution of Slavery, over which we have no control. Under such circumstances, we cannot be held answerable.

It may be said that the seventh article in the amended Constitution, which gives a trial by jury "where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars," does not apply to a case like this. The provision is, "in suits at common law." This is not strictly a proceeding at common law. The common law is opposed to the principle of Slavery. The proceeding is under constitutional and statutory provisions, under the forms specially provided, and not according to the course of the common law.

This is represented to be an *ex parte* proceeding. It does not bear this character. Had it been represented to me that the fugitive could produce evidence conducing to prove that he did not owe service to the claimant, time would have been given to procure the evidence. The only allegation as to what the counsel expected to prove by absent witnesses was, that the fugitive had resided in Indiana and Ohio four years, and that he was esteemed and considered a freeman. This the counsel for the claimant admitted; and as no further allegation of evidence was alleged to be in the power of the party, of course there was no ground for a postponement.

The presumption of freedom attaches to every resident of a free State, without regard to colour; and on the same principle, in a slave State, every coloured man is presumed to be a slave. But this presumption, in this case, is counteracted by the facts proved.

It is argued that the evidence is defective, as the record showing the status of the fugitive, as authorized by the act of 1850, is not produced. Such record is not necessary to establish the right of the claimant. If it were produced, the identity of the fugitive would still be an open question. On the question of identity, anything which conduced to prove that the person described in the judgment was not the one before the judge or commissioner, would be admissible.

I am gratified with the gentlemanly bearing and courtesy with which this argument has been conducted. It was due to the occasion and the circumstances. No other course was expected.

Upon the whole, no doubt can exist on the evidence that the fugitive owes service to the claimant; and, under the law, I am bound to remand him to the custody of his master, with authority to take him to the State of Kentucky, the place from whence he fled.

Mr. *Ware*, for the claimant.

Messrs. *Joliffe* and *Birney*, for the fugitive.

LECTURE BY THEODORE PARKER.

It was our good fortune, on Sunday evening last, to hear this remarkable man deliver, in his original style, one of his powerful lectures upon the subject of Slavery in America. Nothing we can write will express too strongly the power of the lecture, or the calm and appreciative demeanour of the audience. The lecturer made his audience stand face to face with that hideous monster which is destroying the happiness of millions of men, degrading a glorious political heritage, and cursing a whole continent. Patiently, boldly, faithfully every lineament of Slavery was sketched. As a master only can, was the picture executed. No false mark to be effaced, no flourish to confuse—the eye compassed the horrible verification of blackest diabolism and the hand gave every line needed to express its depraved hideousness.

The large audience present felt themselves in the presence of a master mind, and to-day that lecture shall live in the memory, and to-morrow it shall live in the heart, and soon it shall live in the actions of those that heard it. Lucid in style, kindly in spirit, practical to such a degree that had it been less skilfully handled, it would have failed from lack of idealism, yet alive with truth and beautiful with wisdom. It had the brilliancy and point of the diamond.

Mr. Parker commenced his lecture by noticing the various degrees of power in the races of men. He gave to the Anglo Saxon race the first place as to power, and recognised America as the field of its fullest development. He then succinctly sketched the relation in which America stood to the Old World, as an exponent of a new science of government, the outcropping of our fundamental idea—a church without a bishop, a State without a king, a community without an aristocracy, and a family without a slave. Our failure or success was of moment, not only to ourselves, but to the world. Every good idea, every good deed was noted by the hopeful in other lands, and every bad deed was paraded by the tyrants of other lands. We had a new idea to develop and illustrate—the idea that government was the servant of the people, not the people the servants of the government. This idea was a composite idea. Its first element was that man had certain rights. The rights were natural—he possessed them not because he was rich, nor because he was poor, but because he was a *man*—they were universal, all men possessed them—equal, depending on no circumstance or condition—inalienable, except by the individual himself. This was the great idea of our government—not always reduced to fact, yet, nevertheless, the idea.

Slavery is in flat contradiction to all this. Its advocates—the most able and influential and outspoken—the Richmond *Enquirer*, DeBow's Review, and ex-Chancellor Hammond, all agree in claiming that Slavery—the subjection of the black man to the white man—is right. The negro was to be bought, sold, taught, and even the question of his having a soul determined on the same ground with hogs and horses. "Hay is good for horses, but not for hogs," hence the Richmond *Enquirer* argued that liberty was good for white men, but not for negroes.

The idea of our government was that man might trade, preach, teach, print, do what he liked, with the single restriction that he should not injure his neighbour. Slavery was in flat contradiction to all this.

The evils of Slavery within the domain of political economy were next depicted. The blight of Slavery upon education, upon the post office—where out of every three cents the free States pay to the general government, two of them go to carry the mail in the impoverished South; upon invention, upon great men, historians, poets and teachers. There is not a Normal school south of Mason and Dixon's line, not a great seat of learning, not a great historian, poet or preacher. This was the effect of Slavery upon the South.

Its effects upon Northern Statesmen, politicians and preachers, were faithfully portrayed, and the lecture was closed by some indications of advancement—some ground for hope. Slavery must die, for we had the best wishes of humanity, the power of truth, and the blessing of God upon every effort for its abolition. We might not have politicians or preachers, but we had the *Truth*, and one with God was a majority.

We have only attempted a meagre skeleton of Mr. Parker's address. The hundreds who crowded Lyceum Hall to its fullest capacity, and heard the address, are under deep obligation to the Salem Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society for such a rare feast of reason and philanthropy. The blessing of those ready to perish is upon them.—*Salem (Mass.) Freeman.*

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURE.—The second of our Annual Course of Lectures before the Salem Female Anti-Slavery Society was delivered, in Lyceum Hall, on Sunday evening, by Rev. T. W. Higginson, Pastor of the Free Church in Worcester. It was an able, eloquent and exceedingly interesting performance; and it was listened to with close attention by a large and appreciating audience. We can attempt no sketch of the lecture, but only mention the subject of it. Mr. Higginson drew an elaborate and striking parallel between the Feudalism of the Dark Ages of Europe, and the Slavery of our Southern States. He showed wherein Slavery resembles Feudalism—in nearly all points of social and political condition—in its picturesqueness and courtesy of manner, as well as in its serfdom, its customs, laws and personal relations. He said that the great point of *difference* was, that Feudalism had its cathedrals and its Religion to save it from utter condemnation; but Slavery is Godless, and irreligious. We may say, in brief, without mentioning the details of Mr. Higginson's well-drawn sketch, that he succeeded, admirably, in showing that Slavery in America *is* Feudalism—is a relic of that odious and barbaric system, existing now, amidst the light of modern civilization. In concluding, the lecturer showed that Feudalism was finally abolished by the power of *Religion* in the hearts of men, and he believes that the same power of Religion will be equal to the smaller task of extinguishing American Slavery; but it must be a better religion than the existing popular religion of our country, which is in league with this great abomination. Mr. Higginson finally closed by demonstrating that the efforts of the Abolitionists, during the past twenty years, have resulted in meliorating the condition of the slaves in the South, and have hastened the glorious day of universal emancipation.—*Salem (Mass.) Free Democrat.*

SLAVEHOLDING IN CONNECTICUT.

We have a case to present to our readers which may enable them to return a ready answer, the next time some shallow and unreasoning conservative (all conservatives are not such) asks "What has the *North* to do with Slavery?" At the annual meeting of the North Consociation of Hartford County a written complaint was presented against the Church at West Avon by several persons, members of the Church at Farmington, on the ground that gross neglect of discipline existed in said church, one of the members being tolerated in the practice of slaveholding, he owning a large plantation in Louisiana stocked with numerous slaves. This slaveholder resides in the winter on his plantation and during the summer in West Avon. Dissatisfaction has been felt by a few members on this account, one of whom withdrew and another has felt it to be his duty to absent himself from the communion. The complaint desired such action by the Consociation as might be deemed most appropriate, either in the way of advice to the church in question or to the complainants, and referred to the unanimous vote of the General Association in 1848 setting forth the duty of such churches to commence immediate steps of discipline.

The complaint was referred to a committee (Messrs. Porter, Patton and Clarke), who reported that while they had no desire to evade the general question or the merits of this particular case, and indeed did not differ personally from the sentiment expressed by the General Association in 1848, they still deemed it important to proceed in an orderly way and with strict regard to the rights of individual churches as guarded by Congregationalism. They considered that Consociation could never commence discipline, but only issue it when orderly brought before them by some party to it, and that it could not give advice touching a specific case in a church which had not asked it, and when that very case might yet come before the Consociation judicially by appeal and should not therefore be prejudged. The report of the Committee also pointed out two ways in which the complainants might orderly prosecute the case: first, by inducing aggrieved members of the West Avon church to complain to the Consociation, and secondly, by inducing a neighbouring consociated church to present West Avon church for neglect of discipline as unworthy of membership in the body. The report was unanimously adopted.

It was a curious fact developed before the Committee, that the church at Farmington, to which the complainants belonged, also had a slaveholding member, resident in Missouri, though they were ignorant of it. We doubt not that a score of such churches might be found in the State, and an equal or greater proportion in other free States, showing that when we contend for disfellowshipping slaveholders, we have at issue a practical matter for our own churches, and also explaining in part why so many Northern pastors oppose a rigid rule on this subject. Our large commercial cities abound in these cases, and such communicants, usually wealthy and influential, make very conservative pastors, who, in our home and foreign missionary societies and in ecclesiastical bodies, are active in denouncing and resisting Anti-Slavery measures.—*Hartford Religious Herald.*

THE LAW OF EXTRADITION.

MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL CUSHING has written and published an opinion upon the case of William Calder, which the *Journal of Commerce* commends as able, and which it says will "deeply interest the general reader." It has certainly interested us.

Calder was arrested under the Treaty of Aug. 9, 1844, as a fugitive from Justice, charged with the crime of FORGERY, committed in Great Britain.

Judge Edmonds, of New York, decided that, in his opinion, "there is not evidence enough of the criminality of the said Calder, according to the laws of the State of New York, to justify his apprehension and commitment for trial for the offence charged, if the same had been committed in said State."

A motion was submitted to the Court that the party be remanded, until new evidence could be procured from Great Britain to maintain the charge. The judge declined for want of authority, as that power rested, if anywhere, with the government of the United States.

The Secretary of State is next applied to, to detain the prisoner in custody, until other evidence can be procured. The Attorney General replies, for the Secretary of State, that this cannot be done. The President has power, for the sake of avoiding disputes of jurisdiction, to cause proceedings in any case to be *instituted*; but after that, he has no power, except to execute the decree of the magistrate.

It appears, then, that when a fugitive from justice, charged with murder, robbery, forgery, &c., is arrested, our courts cannot give him up to be tried at the place where the alleged crime was committed, unless the evidence of criminality is such as would justify the arrest and commitment of the fugitive, *in the State where he is arrested.*

Moreover, it is settled that the magistrate must determine the case upon the evidence presented to him; and if it be not sufficient, he has no power, nor has the President, to detain the prisoner in custody until additional evidence can be sent for.

Now let this be compared with the law in the case of fugitive slaves. The man claimed is, upon affidavit, sent in haste out of the jurisdiction of the court hearing the case into bondage.

All the favour of court, all its patience and leniency, are in favour of the claimant of the fugitive. It only requires a bold demand, an affidavit, and an oath, and the fellow is sent off to the plantation.

The charge of murder, robbery, or forgery, is not so fatal, under American law, as the charge of escaping from bondage—a white scoundrel has ten chances in law over the best black man that ever drew breath.—*H. B. Stowe, in the Independent.*

PLATFORMS AT A DISCOUNT.—The *Boonville Ledger* (Oneida Co.) has hitherto been what is called a "Democratic" paper, rather "Soft" than otherwise, but a pretty steady follower of "the party" wherever it might see fit to go. The rupture proclaimed at Syracuse has given it an opportunity to discard all old platforms and construct one of its own, which (like most home-made platforms) is a great improvement on any that is got up at Baltimore, Philadelphia or Syracuse. Here are some of his criticisms on the latest Syracuse wares:

"We do not see that the one section sets forth any principles in its resolutions repugnant to those of the other. These two parties also, like the other old divisions, are distinctions without a difference. Both give their adhesion to the Fugitive Slave Act 'CHEERFULLY,' and discard any 'reluctance encouraged by abstract opinions' about the rights of man. Both indorse the Compromise Measures in full. Both agree as to State policy. *There may be some question which is the legitimate* 'Jacob Townsend,' *but there can be no doubt at all but they furnish the public with* 'sarsaparilla' *of just the same sort.*

"For our own part, we do not mean to give homage or praise to the Compromise Measures, and our *obedience* to the Fugitive Slave Act will be of the most 'reluctant,' rather than of the 'cheerful' sort. We cannot and will not follow Messrs. John Van Buren, Cochrane, Grover, and such lapsed Free Soilers, in their shameless cheers and acclamations in favour of the bonds, and burdens, and degradations which the Slave Power has fastened upon the people of the North.

"We shall think ourselves *regular* if we are *Right*. We shall evince our faith in Democracy by advocating just and impartial legislation, the highest interests, and the dearest Rights of Man. We shall acknowledge the DUTIES which are correlative to our rights, and just as positive as those rights. We shall regard the dogma of the Golden Rule, and the duty which enjoins the Conservatism of Morals and Humanity, as of higher authority than the party platforms set up to-day and deserted to-morrow."

OHIO A SLAVE STATE.—Judge SPOONER, at Cincinnati, recently made a decision, which, if it be sustained, will make Ohio to all intents and purposes a slave State. The case was that of two men who seized a coloured man, and were in the act of taking him out of the State, without any process of law, on a pretended charge of larceny. The object was to take him into Kentucky and reduce him to Slavery. The case was one of flagrant outrage: but the Judge acquitted them, on the ground that the man seized *was not proved to be a freeman, and that colour was prima facie evidence of Slavery.* This, too, in face of the constitutional provision that "There shall be no Slavery in this State; nor involuntary servitude, unless for the punishment of crimes."

This decision has excited even more surprise and animadversion than the recent one of Judge Flinn—something better having been expected of Judge Spooner. The press generally has condemned it. Even the *Ohio Statesman* speaks out in terms of just reprehension of it. Says the *Statesman:*

"The Cincinnati *Columbian* has a capital article upon Judge Spooner's late decision in the kidnapping case. The criminal jurisprudence of Hamilton county is getting to be the standing wonder and laughing stock of the country. You might as well save the expense of trials, and toss up coppers, 'heads or tails,' to see whether parties charged shall be adjudged guilty. The only hope of reform lies in the press and the people. Brethren of Cincinnati, do your duty, and lash stupidity and imbecility without sparing." — *Columbus Columbian.*

MISS HOLLEY'S LECTURE.—Our citizens were favoured, Sunday, with a rich, though novel, entertainment, by the able and eloquent discourse of Miss Holley. As a daughter of so distinguished a person as the late Hon. Myron Holley, of Rochester, N. Y. she was reared in the true Anti-Slavery school, with sterling native talents, and large powers of discourse, she has added the body and finish of a thorough education, which eminently fits her to detail the wrongs of oppression.

Miss Holley's lecture was rich in thought, elegant in diction, chaste in style, and delivered with powerful pathos.

Her whole appearance is modest and lady-like, and her address peculiarly engaging. She possesses a great deal of earnest sympathy, which is successfully imparted to her hearers. Never have we seen the City Hall so crowded and held with such absorbed interest so long. Her appeals were irresistible, often moving large numbers to tears. Miss Holley has been earnestly requested to remain and speak again, which she probably will.—*Detroit Free Democrat.*

MRS. STOWE IN LEEDS.

[The following is Mrs. Stowe's Reply to an Address presented to her by the Leeds Anti-Slavery Society, shortly before her embarkation for the United States.]

MY DEAR FRIENDS: The last few months have been among the most interesting of my life. In these few months the imaginings and dreams of many years have become present realities; countries and people, once dim visions, have become near. My heart has found not only the silent beauty of art, but the warm glow of friendship and affection, in lands once foreign, but to me foreign no more.

It was with a thrill of feeling that I first set foot on the shore of England—land of our fathers—land of our language, of our history, laws, and literature, whose poets have so thoroughly embalmed and consecrated it, that each new object seemed to me well known and familiar. The green ivy and holly, the crimson daisy, the primrose, the "hedge-row-elms," the historic ruins, were all what I had read of from infancy; so that, even had there been none to welcome me, I should have felt as if coming back to a home. But the homes of England and of Scotland—the succession of bright, warm, secluded nooks and dells of social love and peace, which have so freely opened themselves to me—these, these are never to be forgotten, nor can those dear friends which are encircled by them.

Now I am going; and to the last I find myself surrounded by kindness—leaving England, as I found it, amid the tender cares of my friends only too kind.

Of the sympathy which has been shown here in this country with the generous cause of freedom, I cannot think without emotion. Every friend of the cause in America has

I have confidence in my country. We are, after all, a great and generous people; we can afford to have our faults told, that we may mend them. Slavery is not a part of us—we do not desire it—and we shall yet be free from it. England has her excrescences too, the growth of past ages; and as she never makes any outcry at their being criticised by us, we see that she is labouring in all good faith and honesty to make everything right at home, and therefore we take no offence at her friendly freedom with us.

Nothing is more evident to the sojourner in England than this, that no order of men or things is here considered too sacred and immaculate for free inquiry and discussion. Everything here, however consecrated by rank, or station, or antiquity, is given up to the freest public handling, and the most rigorous inquiry; and it does not become us, who profess to be the most progressive nation on earth, to shield any of our institutions behind the barrier of privileged silence, and require all mankind to take them on trust.

I have visited in my pilgrimage the home of Clarkson. I passed a night in the chamber that for years consecrated by his prayers, and from whence he ascended to heaven. There I reflected how the great cause of emancipation once looked as impossible and hopeless in England as it does now in America; how Clarkson nearly lost his life in a public tumult in Liverpool; and yet *that* victory has been gained: faith and prayer, and labour, triumphed in England, and I trust shall triumph yet in America.

It has, I hear, been said by some, that I have given to this cause time, health, and strength, that ought rather to have been given to my family; that a wife and mother should confine her thoughts and efforts to her own circle.

Of this I have thought most seriously, for I am conscious that I have truly given life-blood which I needed in the care and education of my children.

But, during the dreadful ravages of the cholera in Cincinnati, and when nine thousand were buried in three months, I went out to a neighbouring cottage, and found a mother lying alone helpless in her bed, and a sick baby by her side. I thought, is it not my duty to nurse this child? It occurred to me then that I had but little strength; that if I spent that, the destroyer might at any moment enter my own circle, and then who would nurse my children? Was that a selfish thought? Nevertheless, God helping me, I took the poor baby home, and we nursed it under my roof: it died there, and we buried it; in one week more my own darling, before so healthy, sickened at the same disease, and went the same way to the grave, and the destroyer passed through my family.

But I did not lament that work of mercy, even though it had brought sorrow to me and mine. So is it in this case. A wife myself, I have spoken for other wives; a mother, for other mothers: and if it shall prove at last that I have thus spent strength and life that my children wanted, then may God remember them, as I have remembered the children of the poor slave!

Let me thank these dear friends, whose generosity and kindness has thus shown itself to me in the moment of my departure. Never will the memory of those friends in England and Scotland be affaced from my heart; and among those many memorials of kindness which will adorn my quiet home, none will be more pleasant than this from the friends in Leeds.

THE WILKESBARRE SLAVE CASE

Judge Grier's Opinion.

PHILADELPHIA, Saturday, Oct. 15, 1853.

EX-PARTE John Jenkins and James Crozier—in the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

As all cases involving questions concerning the jurisdiction and powers of the Courts of the United States, and those of the several States, especially if they have any connection with Congress, "concerning fugitives "from justice and persons escaping from the service of "their masters," excite much public attention, and seem peculiarly liable to misrepresentation from the garbled statements of those who undertake to report them; I have concluded to reduce to writing the opinions I entertain in this case.

Our very peculiar institutions, which require of every citizen a double allegiance and obedience to two distinct sovereigns, with independent judiciary systems emanating from each, make it especially necessary that great caution and prudence be exercised by their respective tribunals, in order to avoid any collision or conflict in the exercise of their respective jurisdictions over the same subjects and persons. That there should be great diversity of opinion as to the limits of the power of either sovereign and its Courts, may naturally be expected. But without adopting the political opinions of extremists on either side, it is the duty of Courts, in order to have no unpleasant collision, to carefully avoid the assumption of powers not plainly confided to them, and, at the same time, to perform the duties imposed upon them with firmness and resolution, disregarding the clamour or the contumely of heated partisans.

The jurisdiction of the courts of the United States is limited, but within its limits supreme. The State courts have often, in many cases, a concurrent jurisdiction over the same subjects and persons. But neither can treat the other as an inferior jurisdiction, except in the cases where the Constitution and acts of Congress have given such power to the courts of the Union. Where persons or property are liable to seizure or arrest by the process of both, that which first attached should have the preference. Any attempt of either to take them from the legal custody of the officers of the other would be an unjustifiable exercise of its power, and lead to most deplorable consequences. Therefore, if a person be imprisoned under the civil or criminal proofs of one, the other cannot take him from such custody in order to subject him to punishment for an offence against them. A fugitive cannot be taken from the legal custody of the Sheriff by any warrant from the courts of the United States, in order to extradition under the acts of Congress. Neither can such fugitive, when in custody of the Marshal, under legal process from a judge or commissioner of the United States, be delivered from such custody by means of a habeas corpus or any other proofs, to answer for an offence against the State, whether felony or misdemeanour, or for any other purpose.

While the Act of Congress does not forbid the issuing of a *habeas corpus* by a State Judge, it carefully guards against the abuse of it, and makes a certificate of a commissioner or Judge of the United States "conclu- "sive evidence of the right of the person or persons in "whose favour it is granted to remove such fugitive," and forbids "all molestation of such person or persons "by any process issued by any court, judge, magis- "trate, or any person whomsoever." This Act of Congress is the supreme law of the land, and binding on the conscience of State Judges as well as those of the United States. Judges of the United States, as well as of State courts, are therefore bound to dismiss a writ of *habeas corpus*, or to refuse to allow it, whenever they are properly informed that the prisoner is held by legal process under this Act, and not to suffer it to be abused by mischievous intermeddlers for the purpose of "molestation" of the officer or owner of the fugitive in effecting his extradition.

The laws of the United States give ample remedy by habeas corpus for those illegally imprisoned under colour of their process—and State courts have in many instances exercised a concurrent jurisdiction in similar cases. But State courts or Judges have no power under a habeas corpus to review or sit in error upon the judgments or process of the judicial officers of the United States acting within the jurisdiction committed to them, as has sometimes been done. I have known of one instance (and heard of others), where a fugitive legally in custody, has been discharged on habeas corpus, under the pretence or affectation of judicial ignorance that Slavery existed in Virginia. Such an abuse of judicial discretion was held to be no defence to those who knowingly rescued the fugitive by means of it. Whether such an illegal discharge would protect the Marshal from the high penalty inflicted on him for permitting an escape, may well be doubted; and if he should resist it, as possibly he would, it would lead to a very unpleasant conflict, which every good citizen should be careful to prevent.

I have made these remarks as preliminary to entering upon the question now before us, in order to rectify a misapprehension and gross misapplication of those made on a former occasion, and also that persons whose zeal in favour of fugitives is sometimes permitted so far to outrun their discretion, may be aware of the mischievous consequences, both to themselves and others, which are likely to ensue from attempts thus to abuse the process of State Courts, and bring them into conflict with those of the United States.

The prisoners, John Jenkins and James Crossen, have been brought before the Court by virtue of a writ of habeas corpus issued and allowed by me on the 4th of October, and directed to J. B. Chollet. The petition for this writ sets forth that the petitioners are deputies of the Marshal of the United States for this district; that a warrant was placed in their hands by said Marshal, issued by E. D. Ingraham, Esq., Commissioner, and indorsed by a Judge of the Supreme Court, directing them to arrest a negro named William Thomas, who, being held to labour and service in the State of Virginia, and owing the same to a certain Isham Keith, of Farquhar County, Virginia, had escaped therefrom into the State of Pennsylvania; that they proceeded to Wilkesbarre, Luzerne County, Pa., where the fugitive was found; that they attempted to arrest him in obedience to said warrant; that the arrest was resisted with great violence, and, after a severe struggle, the fugitive succeeded in escaping. They complain that they have been arrested and imprisoned under colour of a warrant from a Justice of the Peace of Luzerne County, charging them with an assault and battery on said fugitive, with intent to kill, and pray to be discharged from said imprisonment.

To this writ of habeas corpus Chollet makes return—that he detains the prisoners by virtue of a certain warrant issued by Gilbert Burrows, a justice of the peace for the borough of Wilkesbarre, and indorsed by an Alderman of Philadelphia.

The warrant sets forth an information upon the oath of a certain William Gilderslevе, "that Geo. Wynkoop, John Jenkins and James Crossen, in a riotous manner, with pistols and other weapons, beat and wounded a certain coloured man named Bill, and that they assaulted, beat and abused the same Bill, as the deponent believed, with intent to kill him."

On the return of this writ on Wednesday last, objection was made to any action by the Court upon it, by learned counsel, who appeared without stating on whose behalf, or by whom they were authorised to interfere in the matter. Being desirous to hear any objection which could be made as to the extent of the power of the Court in this matter, these gentlemen were willingly heard as *amici curiæ*, without any inquiry as to who had authorized them to take a part in the proceedings.

It was objected that the Court had no authority to discharge the prisoners, because they were held by a warrant from a State magistrate for an alleged criminal offence against the State of Pennsylvania; and that the warrant was conclusive evidence of the fact. To a habeas corpus issued by this Court, under the general authority conferred on them by the judiciary act, this objection would be conclusive. But this writ was not allowed and issued under the general law, but under the special powers conferred by the seventh section of the act of Congress of second of March, 1833, ch. 57; which, so far as is material to our present inquiry, is as follows:

"And be it further enacted, that either of the Justices of the Supreme Court, or a Judge of any District Court, of the United States, in addition to the authority already conferred by law, shall have power to grant writs of habeas corpus in *all* cases of a prisoner or prisoners in jail or confinement, where he or they shall be committed or confined *on, or by any authority or law, for any act done or omitted to be done, in pursuance of the United States*, or any order, process or decree of any Judge or Court thereof, anything in any act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding."

For the purpose of the discussion and argument of this point it was necessary to assume that the facts set forth in the prisoner's petition were true, leaving the proof of them to be made out afterward. The petition states distinctly that the prisoners have been committed for an act done in executing process issued in pursuance of a law of the United States. It therefore comes within the provisions of this act.

"The writ of habeas corpus is a high prerogative writ known to the common law; the great object of which is the liberation of those who may be imprisoned without sufficient cause. It is in the nature of a writ of error to examine the legality of the commitment; it brings the body of the prisoner up, together with the cause of his confinement. The Court can undoubtedly inquire into the sufficiency of that cause."—See ex parte Watkins, 3 Peters, 201.)

A warrant of arrest issued by a Justice of the Peace has none of the characteristics of a judgment of a court of record, and is therefore not conclusive evidence that the prisoner is rightly deprived of his liberty. It is every day's practice to inquire into its regularity, and whether it has been issued on sufficient grounds to justify the arrest and imprisonment. If this could not be done, the writ of habeas corpus would little deserve the eulogies which it has received as a protection to the liberty of the citizen. Warrants of arrest, issued on the application of private informers, may show on their face a prima facie charge sufficient to give jurisdiction to the Justice; but it may be founded on mistake, ignorance, malice or perjury. To put a case very similar to the present, A tells B that he has seen C kill D. B runs off to a justice, swears to the murder boldly without any knowledge of the fact, and takes out a warrant for C, who is arrested and imprisoned in consequence thereof. C prays a habeas corpus, and shows that he was the Sheriff of the County, and hanged D in pursuance of a legal warrant. If a court could not discharge a prisoner in such a case, because the warrant was regular on its face, the writ of habeas corpus is of little use. Every arrest of the person is an assault and battery and attended with force and violence against a resisting party; and if made by three or more persons is a riot, provided the fact be concealed that it was made in execution of a legal warrant.

The authority conferred on the judges of the United States by this act of Congress gives them all the power that any other court could exercise under the writ of habeas corpus, or gives them none at all. If under such a writ they may not discharge their officer when imprisoned "*by any authority*," for an act done in pursuance of a law of the United States, it would be impossible to discover for what useful purpose the Act was passed. Is the prisoner to be brought before them only that they may acknowledge their utter impotence to protect him? This Act was passed when a certain State of this Union had threatened to nullify Acts of Congress, and to treat those as criminals who should attempt to execute them; and it was intended as a remedy against such State legislation. If the State of Pennsylvania had by act of legislature declared that the fugitive law should not be executed within her borders, and had directed her officers to arrest and imprison those of the United States who should attempt to execute it, would not this court have been bound to treat such act as unconstitutional and void, and discharge their officers from imprisonment under it? And have they no power to do so, when mischievous intermeddlers endeavour to pervert and abuse State process for the same purpose? If the Marshal and his officers may be arrested for serving process, why not the Commissioner and Judge who issued the process? The extremest advocate of State rights would scarcely contend that in such cases the courts of the United States should be wholly unable to protect themselves or their officers. Let us look at the consequences. While the Marshal's officers in this case were endeavouring to retake the prisoner who had escaped from them, the person who afterward swore to the information on which this warrant was issued had a warrant put in the hands of the Sheriff, which he very wisely refused to execute, knowing the persons charged to be acting under the authority of the laws of the United States. Now, let us suppose the Marshal's officers had succeeded in making the arrest, and the Sheriff had attempted to execute the process, what would have been the consequence? If the Marshal resists, a contest ensues, which may be called, in fact, a war between officers, each acting and justifying their conduct under proof from their respective sovereigns. If the Sheriff succeeds, as probably he would, the fugitive is discharged, and the officers of the United States conveyed to prison. If such a state of affairs can be brought about at the instance of any mischievous or unprincipled person, who is willing to swear without scruple to that which he does not know to be true, or perhaps knows to be false, then, indeed, has been discovered a safe mode of nullifying the Constitution and laws of the United States. Those who celebrate the anniversaries of the Syracuse riots, and of the Christiana murder, may well rejoice at the discovery.

Not believing that the courts of the United States have been left in this hopeless condition, or that we are required and authorized to issue a habeas corpus, without any power to release the prisoners if unjustly detained, the objection to the jurisdiction and power of the court was overruled, and the further hearing of the case postponed till the 12th of October, in order that proof might be made of the facts stated in the petition, and that the State of Pennsylvania, through her known officers, might appear, if she saw fit, and show any just cause of complaint against the officers now in arrest.

On that day the same learned gentlemen who had appeared on the former occasion came forward and proposed to take a part in the proceeding. They were requested to state whom they represented, and to show their authority, if they had any, to intervene on behalf of the State of Pennsylvania. It was answered that they had been employed by the Constable who made the arrest. To which it was replied by the Court that their duty to their client ended when they had made out his return to the writ of habeas corpus; that the Constable had no more concern with the result of this proceeding than any other citizen. That the United States Government has appeared by its proper representation in defence of its officers; and if the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by any officer entitled to represent her, avows this proceeding, and complains that her laws have been transgressed by the prisoners, they should be heard. That, if the gentlemen had any authority from the Governor or Attorney-General of Luzerne County, they should be heard. But, as the Court had no reason to believe that any one of those officers had shown, or would show, the least countenance to such proceedings, and as the person who had a right to complain, as the injured party (if any one had) has confessed the justice of his arrest by fleeing the country, we would not permit mere volunteers to interfere for the purpose of embroiling the State of Pennsylvania, against her will, with the United States, or that any society of persons, however respectable, should assume to be the guardians of her peace and dignity.

Evidence was then received to show that the prisoners were Deputies of the Marshal—that a lawful warrant was put into their hands commanding them to arrest one William Thomas, a fugitive from labour; that in pursuance of this warrant they arrested said fugitive; that he resisted with great violence, and made attempts to wound and kill the officers; that he succeeded in escaping from their arrest, ran into the river, where, armed with a knife, he declared he would not be taken alive; and that the officers, seeing this to be his determination, gave up the attempt to recapture him, and came away; and that for these acts, done in obedience to their writ, they had been falsely charged with riot and assault and battery. The counsel for the prisoners having thus shown, as they contended, a case sufficient to authorize their discharge, closed their case. But the Court being informed that a number of respectable persons were present, who had witnessed the transaction, and being desirous to ascertain whether the officers had acted in an unjustifiable manner, such as to call for censure or punishment, ordered the depositions of those persons to be taken by a Commissioner. In order, also, to ascertain upon what grounds the sworn information was made, and who were the persons procuring it, the deposition of Wm. C. Guilderslevе, on whose oath the warrant was founded, was taken; it being due to the person that he should be allowed to justify himself for the course he has pursued. In order to obtain this warrant for the prisoners, he had signed a deposition, stating positively that the prisoners had committed an assault and battery on Bill or William Thomas, with pistols, &c., with intent to kill him. He *now says* on oath that he was not present, and knows nothing of the transaction whatever; that he did not see William Thomas that day at all; that a certain Joseph Easterline had told him "that a man was shot at the river bank and was dying," and "that it was a coloured man that was shot;" that he immediately consulted Mr. Collins, and, after finding out the name of one of the prisoners, that he then went to a justice of the peace, and told him there had been a man shot at the river bank, and he wanted a warrant; that the justice wrote out an information and read it to him, and he swore to it—*to the best of his knowledge and belief*; that he never swore out a warrant against anybody before, and it was a new business to him, but he did it by the counsel of Collins; that he did not know the persons who attempted to arrest Bill were officers at that time; that he cannot tell what he swore to before Esquire Goff in order to obtain the warrant; that he did not see the prisoners fire pistols; got all his information from Easterline and Seaman; that his "interview with them was very brief—done in a minute;" that he had no belief of what the officers came for, his "mind being wholly intent on the single object of obtaining a warrant at that time;" that he thought a man had been killed by shots, and made no further inquiry. That he got the warrant and delivered it to the sheriff, and told him he wanted to execute it. Nothing was done on this warrant. Some two weeks after this, after the witness had learned that the fugitive was not shot, and that the prisoners were officers, and had made the unsuccessful attempt to arrest the fugitive, an affidavit was brought to him, ready written out by Squire Burroughs (on which this warrant was issued). Burroughs had made out the affidavit at request of Messrs. Brown and Jackson. That it was intended when the information was drawn out, that one Kutz should swear to it; but as it was inconvenient to find Kutz, the Squire told him it did not make a particle of difference whether he or Kutz swore to it, and he signed and swore to it, after hearing it read. That he cannot tell who employed Messrs. Jackson and Brown, but supposed it was some person in Philadelphia. That he knew nothing of them until they introduced themselves to him in his store. That it never came into his mind to state to the magistrate that the persons claimed to be Marshal's officers making an arrest; and finally, that "he knew nothing about any pistol or fire arms, or any knives and forks, or anything under heaven."

Comment on such conduct is superfluous. It is enough to say that it shows to the Court, that while the sane and intelligent portion of the population of Wilkesbarre, who witnessed this transaction, and the public prosecutor, whose duty is was to prosecute offences against the public peace, have not seen proper to institute any proceedings, some philanthropic individual, or association, in Philadelphia, have ventured to take the people of Luzerne county under their protection, and have been so fortunate as to find a witness willing to swear to an information, of the truth or falsehood of which, by his own account, he was utterly ignorant. Imputing no bad motive to the witness for such rash and ill-advised conduct, we think he has suffered his zeal to outrun his discretion, and are pleased to see that he is now better informed, and, in his last deposition, has refused to "testify to that which he has heard by report from others," and he now believes "that rumour is no testimony."

In order to correct any false impressions which may have been received with regard to this transaction, we think it proper to give a brief history of the facts as elicited from the testimony of numerous and respectable eye-witnesses who have been examined and testify not to rumour, but to what they saw and heard.

The three Deputies of the Marshal, accompanied by two gentlemen from Virginia, who were well acquainted with the fugitive to be arrested, entered the dining-room of the Phœnix Hotel, in the morning, about 7 o'clock, and found the negro Bill, or William Thomas, in the room. The agent of the owner took hold of the fugitive and handed him over to the officers, saying, "this is the boy I require you to take under the warrant"—as the officers proceeded to arrest him, telling him they were United States officers, a violent struggle ensued; the landlord of the hotel, who was sitting at his breakfast, got up and went around the table, and said, "Bill, give up, there is no use to resist." Bill called for his pistols. The landlord attempted to get hold of him. Bill made a pass at him, to hit him in the face, but missed it, and struck him on the shoulder. The officers attempted to secure him; one of them seized him round the waist—he was thrown on the floor; but rising with them, he obtained possession of a carving-knife, and attempted to stab Mr. Settle, who had come to the assistance of the officers. This blow was partially warded off by another person, so that Settle was struck with the handle instead of the point of the knife, on his elbow, and disabled him from rendering further assistance. The knife being taken from him, the officers endeavoured to secure the prisoner's hands with shackles or handcuffs, but succeeded only in getting them on his right wrist, when Bill struck Cresson, one of the deputies, over the head with handcuffs, inflicting a cut on his temple, and stunning and disabling him for a time. Bill was again thrown down, the officers in vain attempting to secure his hands with the handcuffs; Bill rose up with them, and seized a table-knife and wounded slightly the hands of Jenkins, who held him around the waist. This knife was wrested from him, and likewise a fork which he had seized. While Bill had possession of the carving knife, and was endeavouring to stab the officers, some one cried out to them, "Why don't you shoot him;" one of them answered, "We don't want a dead negro." "Do not hurt him," one of the witnesses said, "he fought desperately, and endeavoured to kill them." He made his way to the door at length, with two of the officers endeavouring to hold him, and finally released himself from them, and escaped and ran towards the river. The officers then said they would try to frighten him, and fired off pistols, but did not point the pistols towards him. Bill waded into the river; some one furnished him with a large knife. The officers then dispatched a messenger for the Sheriff, who refused to render them any assistance. Bill's clothes were much torn, and considerable blood had been shed over his face and clothes in the struggle; a large crowd collected; some exhorted Bill not to be taken alive, and he declared his intention to die or be drowned rather than be taken. The officers, after dallying some time, being afraid to make further attempts to arrest him, as no one would assist them, gave up the attempt and went away, saying, "as a negro would not be taken alive, and they did not want him dead, they would pursue him no further." After the departure of the officers, Bill said to two witnesses, who inquired of him if he was hurt, "that he was not hurt, but had some bruises about the face." He was afterward taken away by some person on a wagon, and made his final escape.

We are unable to perceive, in this transaction, anything worthy of blame in the conduct of these officers in their unsuccessful endeavours to fulfil a most dangerous and disgusting duty; except, perhaps, a want of sufficient courage and perseverance, in the attempt to execute the writ. A careful examination of the testimony sufficiently exhibits the reason why those who were acquainted with the facts of the case have been unwilling to prosecute the officers for their unsuccessful attempt, and left it to those who, to use their own language, "knew nothing about it under heaven."

In conclusion, as we find that the prisoners are officers of the United States, "in confinement for acts "done in pursuance of a law of the United States, and "under process from a Judge of the same, that they "have not exceeded the exigency of the proofs under "which they acted. That this prosecution has not "been instituted, nor is now acknowledged by the "State of Pennsylvania, but has its origin in some as- "sociation living at a distance, and wholly ignorant of "the whole transaction which they have volunteered "to investigate. That the information on which the "warrant to arrest the prisoners is founded was sworn "to by one who did not know whether the matter of "the affidavit presented to him was true or false, and "that by a statement of but half the truth, it is wholly "false."

The prisoners are therefore discharged.

PROGRESS OF BRITISH INTEREST IN THE ANTI-SLAVERY CAUSE.

ENGLISH newspapers of established reputation are chary of their space, and particularly sparing of their editorial columns, except upon subjects which are known to be interesting to the majority of their readers. We may therefore reasonably consider it an indication of increasing interest in the Anti-Slavery cause, when papers enjoying such a vast circulation as the London *Morning Advertiser* and the *Leeds Mercury* (the ablest and most widely extended provincial newspaper in England), devote column after column, both of selections and of original writing, to the advocacy of the Anti-Slavery cause and the promulgation of Anti-Slavery information. For example, we have now before us the *Leeds Mercury* of the 3d and the 10th of September. In the first of these papers is a long leading article, intended probably as a parting compliment to Mrs. Stowe, who left Liverpool for America on Wednesday, the 7th of the same month; but evincing also an amount of information respecting the bearings of Slavery upon all classes, sects, and interests in the United States, and the difficulties which the Abolitionists have to contend with, which is most gratifying in one so honourably connected with the public press as Mr. Edward Baines. It is hardly worth our while to complain that, in setting up the discretion displayed by Mrs. Stowe in her writings, as an example for the Abolitionists to follow in their proceedings, the editor appears to forget that there is a wide difference between the circumstances under which an author produces the most powerful work of genius in the retirement of the closet, and the turmoil and struggle the Abolitionists of the United States have had to undergo in their contest with Slavery—a system that has enlisted the support of millions of shallow patriots, as identified with the political unity of the country; of the religious world, from a dread of breaking up the compact strength of their churches; and of the trading and commercial classes, from a desire to participate in its unholy gains. The *Leeds Mercury* of the 10th, devotes nearly five columns to Mrs. Stowe, including a very particular account of a social party held at Leeds, at which a hundred sovereigns and a silver basket with an appropriate inscription were presented to that lady. Speeches were made by the mayor and other gentlemen, and an address on behalf of the Leeds Anti-Slavery Association and other contributors was read by Mr. Wilson Armistead. This address elicited a feeling reply from the distinguished authoress, which we cannot forbear presenting to our readers.—*London Anti-Slavery Advocate.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

Donations to the TREASURY of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1853.

Second Decade Anniversary OF THE FORMATION OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

IT is almost twenty years since the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY was organized by a Convention held for that purpose in the City of Philadelphia. How eventful is the history of the Society and of our country during this period! The Society, faithful in a good degree to the great principles on which, as upon the Everlasting Rock, it was so wisely founded, has gone forward steadily and fearlessly in its work of exposing the sinfulness of Slavery and its dire effects upon the pecuniary prosperity, the political relations, and the moral character of the Nation, and demanding, as the right of the slave and the duty of the master, Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation. Happy would it have been for our country, and O how happy for those who now pine in bondage! if the voice thus lifted up in the name of Justice and Liberty had been heeded and obeyed. But, alas! the American People, like Pharaoh of old, hardened their hearts, refusing to obey the mandate of Jehovah, and practically demanding, "Who is the Lord, that we should obey his voice, to let our bondmen go? We know not the Lord, neither will we let our bondmen go." The area of Slavery has been immensely increased by iniquitous legislation and at the expense of a bloody and atrocious war; the number of slaves has augmented from two and a half to nearly four millions; and the Slave Power exults in the enactment of a new statute for the recovery of fugitive bondmen—a statute worthy of the spirit of Caligula and Draco, and disgraceful alike to our professions of Republicanism, Civilization and Christianity. Each advancing step in the progress of the Society has revealed a still "lower deep" of national corruption and profligacy, until both Church and State are shown to be utterly defiled by the dark spirit of Slavery, and the Constitution so contaminated as to leave no alternative to the friends of freedom but to repudiate its obligations or renounce their allegiance to God.

But notwithstanding these developments of national profligacy, we are far from being discouraged. Indeed, we see in these developments a sure sign of progress and a pledge of final success. We have compelled Slavery to exhibit itself in its true character before mankind; we have succeeded in fixing upon its hideous features the steady gaze of the whole civilized world; we have formed a nucleus around which is gathering, surely if not as rapidly as we could wish, a MORAL POWER which will ere long prove itself too mighty to be successfully resisted. We now know, as we did not at first, the heighth and depth, the length and breadth of the evil which we are struggling to overthrow, and this knowledge is an important preparation for the work that remains to be done. Profiting by the experience of the past, and having a never-failing source of encouragement in the consciousness that our cause is just, and that God and Truth are on our side, we must go forward, regardless of every obstacle, and undismayed by every danger that may beset our path.

In accordance with the vote of the Society at its last Annual Meeting, we hereby invite its members and friends to assemble in Sansom Street Hall, Philadelphia, on Saturday, Sunday and Monday, December 3d, 4th and 5th, to celebrate the Twentieth Anniversary of its Formation. The meeting will open on the first day above named at 10 o'clock, A. M. We hope to see a representation of friends of the cause from every free State, and that, by the presence and labours of many eloquent champions of freedom, the meeting may be instrumental in strengthening the Anti Slavery Sentiment of the country and hastening the day when Liberty shall be proclaimed throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.

By order of the Executive Committee.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *Pres.*

EDMUND QUINCY, SYDNEY H. GAY, *Cor. Secretaries.*

WENDELL PHILLIPS, *Rec. Secretary.*

☞ Papers friendly to the Society are requested to copy the above notice.

ARRIVAL OF MR. MCKIM—HIS LABOURS ABROAD.

WE announce with sincere pleasure the arrival at this port, on Sunday last, in the steamer Atlantic, of Mr. JAMES MILLER MCKIM, the faithful and indefatigable Secretary of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society. Mr. McKim, it will be remembered, left New York for Liverpool in May last, and has therefore been absent a little less than six months. With the exception of a brief tour on the Continent, he has spent his time in Great Britain and Ireland; and although the primary object of his tour was private and personal, rather than public and official, it is no less a pleasure than a duty to acknowledge that, by his personal labours and influence, he has rendered services to the Anti-Slavery Cause, on account of which its friends, both at home and abroad, have cause for felicitation and gratitude. It is no disparagement to the Abolitionists of Great Britain to say, that they needed, at this crisis, just such an interpreter of the Anti-Slavery as well as the Pro-Slavery Sentiment of the United States—one whose long experience, unswerving fidelity, and clearness of moral vision, qualified him to represent his associates at home, and whose frankness, candour, and freedom from all mere partisan influences, were certain to inspire the respect and win the confidence of all whom he approached. Mr. McKim, though an edifying and impressive speaker, has not aspired to serve the cause, except to a very limited extent, by public addresses; but has chosen to labour rather in a more humble and less conspicuous, though by no means less important, sphere. He has visited leading friends of the cause at their own houses, and, in the freedom of personal intercourse, has been enabled to impart as well as to receive much valuable information, for which public meetings are not the appropriate channel. In social circles, gathered at private houses, he has had many opportunities for becoming acquainted with persons who exert a controlling influence in their respective neighbourhoods, and, by making them more familiar with the condition and the wants of the cause in the United States, has qualified them to serve it with greater efficiency than before. In various quarters he has done much to counteract the malign influences which, since 1840, have been operating against the American Anti-Slavery Society and its friends, and to strengthen the cords of attachment between the faithful Abolitionists of Great Britain and their brethren in the United States.

It affords us much satisfaction to observe that Mr. McKim has come back with health invigorated by travel, and with spirits elate and hopeful. He will resume his labours in Pennsylvania with renewed zeal and courage, and with an efficiency that will be felt not only in that State, but throughout the land.

We hope that Mr. McKim will give to the public, in some form, an account of his labours and experience in the Old World; but, in the absence of such an account, we copy the following interesting sketch from the London *Anti-Slavery Advocate*.

MR. J. MILLER MCKIM'S ANTI-SLAVERY LABOURS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

In our last number we noticed a meeting held in London on the 1st of August, in commemoration of West India Emancipation, and gave some extracts from a speech made by Mr. McKim on that occasion. But we omitted to mention that he cut short a very pleasant tour on the Continent for the sake of attending that meeting. During his stay on this side of the Atlantic by far the greater portion of his time has been devoted to the promotion of Anti-Slavery objects, although his visit was originally planned for purposes of health and recreation. Since the 1st of August, Mr. McKim has visited the friends of the cause in Bristol, Leeds, Newcastle, Edinburgh, Perth, Glasgow, Belfast, Dublin, Cork, Bath, and Bridgewater; and we understand it is his intention to give his assistance to an Anti-Slavery meeting to be held in Liverpool on the evening of the 3rd of October, two days previous to his departure for America in the Atlantic steamship. In many of the places we have enumerated, Mr. McKim has held public meetings; in others, he has had interviews with as many friends of the Anti-Slavery cause as could readily be collected; and in all, his sympathy, and the information he was able to afford, has been of material assistance to those who are actively engaged in its promotion.

We have received newspapers from Glasgow, Belfast, and Cork, giving particulars of the meetings held there. The meeting at Glasgow was large and enthusiastic; the chair was taken by Professor Nichol, of the University of Glasgow, and amongst those present our friends in America will be glad to learn was the wife of the professor, formerly Miss Elizabeth Pease, so well known and so highly respected by the friends of the slave. In Belfast, one of the meetings took the form of a tea party; the proceedings were very lively and spirited, and the chair was taken by James Stanfield, Esq, a veteran Abolitionist. From intelligence since received we learn that a disposition is evinced in Belfast to make renewed efforts in behalf of the Anti-Slavery cause. In Cork a public meeting was held on very short notice, at which J. F. Maguire, Esq., M. P., Mayor of the city, presided, and introduced Mr. McKim in an excellent speech, evincing a warm and intelligent interest in the objects of the meeting.

In most of his public addresses, as well as in his more private interviews, Mr. McKim has shown that, notwithstanding the numerical increase of slaves and of slave States since the commencement of the Anti-Slavery agitation by Mr. Garrison and others in 1831, the effect of that agitation has been to undermine the foundations of Slavery in the United States. It has enlightened public opinion, by exposing the recreancy of the American churches and of the great political parties to the cause of humanity and of impartial liberty. It has induced a disposition to judge of men by their religious or political professions. It has produced schisms in many of the ecclesiastical and in all political organizations; and, by appealing from prejudices and selfish interests to reason and conscience, it has promoted the exercise of private judgment on this great question—upon the righteous settlement of which depend the best interests, both present and future, of the United States.

He has shown that while the Anti-Slavery cause, by striking terror to the hearts of the slaveholders, may have induced them in some instances to hold their victims with a tighter grasp, its final result has been to lessen the danger of bloody insurrection, by holding out the hope of deliverance to the slave.

By multiplying the slave's determined, intelligent, and associated friends in the free States, the number of escapes has been vastly increased, the value of slave property has been lessened, and a necessity has been induced of treating with more humanity the slaves on the borders of the free States. The condition of the coloured race in the free States has also been elevated by increasing facilities for education, and the cultivation of habits of self-respect. Even the passing of the Fugitive Slave Law—on which three of the most eminent American Statesmen (Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, all since deceased) had set their hearts—has become a weapon in the hands of the Abolitionists against the system it was meant to support. The horror excited by that enactment produced "Uncle Tom's Cabin," the "Key," and a flood of Anti-Slavery literature such as was never before so suddenly directed into one channel of philanthropic effort. The number of zealous and devoted labourers in the field was never greater than at present; and never was there greater ground to hope for the speedy attainment of their object.

Mr. McKim has always taken care to explain that the members and friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society assert for themselves, when off the Anti-Slavery platform, the Protestant right of private judgment on all subjects, including those of religious opinion and biblical interpretation. They welcome to their ranks people of both sexes and of all sects, classes, and parties who maintain the duty of immediate emancipation, and the unconditional right of the slave to his freedom. In this respect they act on the slave's behalf as all persons do on their own during emergencies of personal difficulty and danger; and whilst they endeavour to keep the Anti-Slavery platform free from the discussion of subjects not necessarily bearing on the Anti-Slavery cause, they do not feel justified in saying to any who come to the rescue of the slave, "stand off, we are holier than thou!" Attempts have often been made to force the adoption of a contrary course upon them, but they know that while it would be unjust in itself, it would speedily reduce the living power of their enterprise to the limited influence of a mere sectarian organization.

In short, notwithstanding the reproaches to which the American Abolitionists have been subjected for their wise and comprehensive policy, our friend informs us that they are virtually like cities set upon a hill, so that wherever you meet a working Abolitionist, you are sure to find a virtuous member of society, a promoter of peace, temperance, and every good word and work; in a word, a man known rather by his fruits than by his profession.

Of course, Mr. McKim never omitted to say that though the Anti-Slavery harvest is white in the United States, the labourers are comparatively very few; and that to these the sympathy and assistance they receive from this side of the Atlantic are full of encouragement. It was well said by Mrs. Stowe, in her Leeds address, that it will be time enough for us to hesitate in our Anti-Slavery zeal when the friends of the slave in America begin to complain of the injury we are doing; that so long as the complaint comes as it now does only from those who uphold Slavery, we may go on aiding the Abolitionists to the best of our power, and with minds perfectly easy as to the consequences.

For our own part, the pleasure we have had in Mr. McKim's society has been qualified only by regret that our interviews were so short and hurried. It is always a great treat to us to meet with one like him, who has been a member of the American Anti-Slavery Society from its foundation; who has been engaged ever since in the thick of the battle; and is "acquainted with every rope of the Anti-Slavery ship." From his kindness, courtesy, firmness, and readiness, he is especially well qualified for the mission he has so generously and devotedly undertaken and fulfilled to the Abolitionists of the three kingdoms.

THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will hold its Anniversary at Norristown, on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday next. There will, we doubt not, be a large attendance on the part of its active members and friends, and many of the enlightened and enterprising people of Norristown will unquestionably embrace the opportunity thus afforded of listening to the discussion of the great question of the age, and of dispensing their hospitality to such as may need it. We understand that our Pennsylvania friends do not anticipate this year the attendance of any prominent champions of the cause from abroad, but the return of Mr. McKim from his mission in the Old World, and the presence of not a few other able speakers from their own ranks, will be quite sufficient to ensure an interesting and profitable Anniversary. One of the editors of the *Standard* intends to avail himself of this opportunity to renew acquaintance with the Abolitionists of Pennsylvania.

JUDICIAL DIABOLISM.

WE publish this week two documents which will go down to posterity as illustrations of the extent to which the Judicial Power of this country is wielded at the dictation and for the benefit of slaveholders, and testify in all time to come to the necessity as well as the justice of the Revolution which the American Anti-Slavery Society is endeavouring to accomplish. We allude to the decision of Judge McLean in the recent Fugitive case in Cincinnati, and that of Judge Grier in the Wilkesbarre case. The newspaper version of the first of those Decisions we published several weeks ago; that now inserted being official and authoritative, is too important to be omitted.

We shall

him up towards the man who were after him; the man with the revolver called to Rex to let him alone or he'd shoot him down; Rex left him and he took again to the water, and laid down with just his head above the water, and said again they should never catch him before he'd drown himself. In a few minutes he walked up in the stream 15 or 20 yards, and then got on the bank and walked along; nobody following him; went slowly along the canal, and I lost sight of him.

Charles Gegenheimer, Jacob G. Fleischman, James W. Laird, James Russell, James F. Orton, John Sparks and Jacob R. Flock, all citizens of the place, who witnessed the affair, testify essentially to the same facts—some of them adding, that the officers threatened to shoot anybody who should take the part of this poor, hunted fugitive. They all testify also, to the exemplary character of the man, and his uniform peaceable deportment.

ASSAULT UPON MR. GARRISON.—It turns out to be true, after all, that Mr. Garrison was assaulted in the street, at the close of the Woman's Rights Convention in Cleveland. The assailant, however, was not Rev. Dr. Nevin, but a hot-blooded and less prudent brother of that gentleman. The publication of the following letter from Dr. Nevin to the *Tribune*, and the reply it called forth from a friend of Mr. Garrison, is all the notice that the matter requires at our hands.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: I was very much surprised when I saw myself reported in your widely-circulated paper, as having made an attack upon William Lloyd Garrison, and wrenched his nose, and had at length to be taken off by my friends. No part of this statement is true in regard to myself.

It is true, however, that when I was attempting to vindicate the Gospel of Christ from some unjust charges made against it by a Mr. Joseph Barker, not long since from England, and well known as a bold Infidel, Mr. Garrison did use the unbecoming language in reference to myself which your paper represents him as doing; I replied to him with mildness and yet firmness. I felt it was due to my professed Christianity and the cause I was advocating to do so. Some individuals, of the large audience, however, did not feel so easy under the charges he made as I did, and it was resolved by one (my youngest brother, who is residing in this city) that he would ask Mr. Garrison for an apology. This he did. Mr. Garrison refused to give one; and then my brother concluded to take an apology from his nose, as he could not obtain one from his lips.

With regard to this undesirable affair, I can say that I had not a whisper of the intention of my brother, and knew nothing about what had taken place until it was all over. Yours respectfully, EDWIN H. NEVIN.

Cleveland, Oct. 14, 1853.

To the Editor of The N. Y Tribune.

SIR: As Mr. Garrison is in the interior of Michigan and not likely very soon, if ever, to see the note from Dr. Nevin in to-day's *Tribune*, nor the reports to his prejudice which the Dr.'s sympathizers have set afloat, I deem it my duty, as his intimate friend, to say, that while it is unquestionably true that he did denounce the conduct and course of Dr. Nevin in the Woman's Rights Convention as rowdyish and mobocratic in spirit, it is, as I believe upon unquestionable information, equally true, that the Dr. gave abundant provocation for such a rebuke. In any place where they are both equally well known, I should be quite willing to leave the people to judge which of the two would be likely first to overstep the bounds of gentlemanly propriety; but while Mr. Garrison was among strangers, even for the most part were bitterly prejudiced against him. Dr. Nevin, as a popular clergyman, could call around him a party of zealous defenders, ready to relieve him from the consequences of his indiscretion by denouncing his antagonist.

It might seem not a little surprising that a professed minister of the Gospel should allude, in a tone of such levity, to an act which is rarely considered defensible among decent world's people, were not the self-satisfaction of Dr. Nevin so very evident in view of this assault committed by his own brother upon the person of one whose principles, as he must have well known, forbade retaliation. It may be true that Dr. Nevin knew nothing of his brother's intention to "take an apology from Mr. Garrison's nose," but the language in which he refers to the cowardly act is well calculated to awaken the suspicion that his own conduct *in* the Convention differed in *form* rather than in *spirit* from that of his brother out of it.

My name is at the service of any one who may care to ask for it. PHILO.

Oct. 19, 1853.

☞ In another column will be found the announcement of the return of J. M. McKim and some account of the gratifying result of his labours among the Anti-Slavery people of Great Britain. The mere mention of these facts should remind us, if nothing else did, that we had the pleasure of welcoming home again, at the same time, one who has been longer absent from the field of Anti-Slavery labour on this side the water, but who, during that absence, had equally, though in a somewhat different way, only changed it for another in Europe. We refer to Miss Sarah Pugh, of Philadelphia. To her own place, in that city, where, for so many years, she has worked so faithfully and so well in that round of duties which—to the blessing of a good cause—has fallen naturally and inevitably to women, she will be welcomed with an affectionate warmth, and that full sense of relief which those only can understand who know what it is to try to make good the absence of one from a position which that one's peculiar adaptation had made all her own. But the local loss of Miss Pugh's services in Philadelphia, for the last year and a half, has been a general gain to the cause at large. For nearly a year she has been in England, and in constant and intimate social intercourse with that class of English people who have a strong interest in the Anti-Slavery question in this country. The influence of such intercourse, even from her own character and presence, could not but be beneficial; but beside that, she has, as we know, devoted herself to extending a knowledge of the cause, its difficulties and its obstacles, as well as its progress and encouragements, to explaining away misunderstandings, in disarming prejudice, in making obscure things plain, in rendering entangled questions easy to be understood, and incapable of being again entangled, among all those with whom she has associated. Her catholic spirit has rebuked bigotry, and her character commanded the respect of those who were hardly willing to tolerate Anti-Slavery in any other than a sectarian garb. It is an easy thing to be anti-slavery in England, after a manner; the difficulty is to be anything else. But to represent there fully and fairly that phase of Anti-Slavery which characterizes the Abolitionists of the American Society, to present it on its own merits, stripping it of the disguises in which secret and open enemies have wrapped it up, and to ensure its recognition as it really is—this is a thing not so easy to do, but the thing which Miss Pugh has done. And we hold that it is not a matter of little importance that, in the pleasant and familiar intercourse of every day life, this should have been done through a large circle of society for a period of many months.

Neither can we refrain from mentioning the return from abroad, at the same time, of another lady—Miss Susan Cabot, of Boston, who, with her sister, Mrs. Follen, has been for several years in Europe. Of the influence of her presence there we can speak in the same terms as of that of Miss Pugh, and on the same authority—that of correspondents in England. Miss Cabot has been, we believe, much of her time on the continent and in London, but neither Americans nor foreigners have been in her society without knowing her position on the Slavery question, and what was the character of the Anti-Slavery she inculcated. Quite as warm a welcome awaits her, particularly among her coadjutors of the Boston Bazaar, as that which Miss Pugh will receive from her friends in Philadelphia.

We are quite certain that neither Miss Cabot nor Miss Pugh will thank us for the sort of publicity which we are here giving to their names; but we cannot with a good grace apologize to them for doing that which if we omitted to do we should have to apologize to the Cause itself.

CUBA.—The New York *Times* of a recent date says: "Our special Telegraphic Correspondence from Washington brings intelligence of important movements of the English Government, in connection with Slavery in the Island of Cuba. It is stated that a treaty has been concluded with Spain, by which England is permitted to prosecute in Cuba a search for slaves that may have been landed. And it is said there is also a prospect of her concluding a treaty by which she will withdraw her cruisers from the coast and permit slaves to be landed *ad libitum*, on condition that they shall be made *Emancipados* for ten years, and that Slavery shall be abolished in Cuba at the end of fifty years. This is "important if true."

JUDGE GRIER.

THE West Chester (Pa.) *Jeffersonian*—a thorough partisan sheet and a supporter of the Administration—comments as follows upon the conduct of Judge Grier in the Wilkesbarre case:

We have just seen a report in the *Evening Bulletin*, of a recent hearing before Judge Grier, of a habeas corpus case, in which the United States officers concerned in the attempt to arrest a fugitive slave at Wilkesbarre, were parties. It appears that those officers were arrested on a warrant issued by a Justice of the Peace, on the charge of riotous conduct at the time of the attempted arrest. The application for a discharge is on the ground that the defendants were United States officers, and protected by their warrants from arrest by the State authorities. Though we do not profess to be learned in the law, it appears to us very clear, for it is no more than plain common sense, that while United States officers are fully protected in the use of as much force as is necessary for the purpose of arresting a fugitive, they are amenable to the State laws for *every act of unnecessary violence*; and if, as is averred, the officers were guilty of shooting at the fugitive, with the intent of taking his life, as he ran along the streets, and as he stood in the river, they are guilty of a crime of which our municipal laws ought to take cognizance. Whether the officers did or did not exceed the measure of their authority is the question, and the determination of it belongs exclusively to our local tribunals. Judge Grier, as a United States Judge has nothing to do with it; and his assumption of jurisdiction is simply and purely an act of usurpation.—Friendly as we have always been to the fair execution of the fugitive slave law, and to a firm adherence to that and all other of the several compromise acts, we cannot but witness with deep regret every attempt to release the officers of the general government from the further restraint imposed by the State laws, for the preservation of the public peace. No good can come from such proceedings. Their only effect is to increase the number of those already too great, who are inimical to the execution of the provisions of the act for the arrest of fugitives. This effect is the more to be feared when the manner of a United States Judge becomes arbitrary, unreasonable, and arrogant. Such conduct in a high judicial officer is always offensive, unbecoming, and out of place; and if it is to be exhibited whenever cases arising under the fugitive slave law happen to arise, more Abolitionists will be created than by a century's agitation by the leaders of the Anti-Slavery faction. If the report to which we have refered be indeed true, Judge Grier is a more dangerous enemy to the rights of the South and the peace of the Union than Garrison, the very arch fiend of fanaticism, himself. We have read that report with pain and mortification, and deeply regret the advantage which it affords to fanatics to bring into unmerited odium a salutary and necessary law.

The following article we copy from the Philadelphia *Register:*

JUDICIAL DECORUM.—Public opinion requires, at all times, a dignified deportment on the part of a judge—the semblance and manner of impartiality, if not the reality. The truculence of the bully and the vivacity of the partisan should be laid aside when the spotless ermine is thrown over the shoulders. There should be nothing to impair the confidence of all parties in the man whose business it is to hear them all, and to maintain the purity of the law and the rights of the citizen.

Judicial wisdom, sobriety, discretion, and prudence, are especially needed in cases where Federal acts are supposed to conflict, or do conflict, with State rights. In these, moderation and conciliation may lead to a harmonious and legal arrangement of points in dispute; while irritating epithets and random insults can only tend to inflame jealousies already deplorable.

We are led to these remarks by the singular ebullitions of Judge Grier, on the recent hearing of the *habeas corpus* case, from Wilkesbarre John Jenkins and James Crosson were arrested for assault and battery with intent to kill, on a warrant issued by a magistrate of the State of Pennsylvania. The arrested parties appealed to Judge Grier to discharge them from custody, on the ground that the alleged offense was committed in the execution of a process issued by United States Commissioner Ingraham. Now, the only point to be decided by Judge Grier, was, whether our State Courts have the right to try a Federal Officer for a crime committed in the execution of civil process, or whether he is amenable to the Federal courts only. Its decision called for no vituperation or sacrifice of judicial decorum.

The report published in the city papers, shows that Judge Grier forgot himself so far as to give vent to the most unrestrained abuse of the State Officer who issued the writ of arrest, and of the citizen who had made the preliminary affidavit—applying the epithet of "*tuppenny magistrate*" to the former, and of "*unprincipled interloper*" to the latter, and threatening them both with legal prosecution.

When a United States Judge so far forgets what is due to his station as to assail a State functionary and a private citizen from the bench, he absolves the press from the respectful silence it habitually observes towards the judiciary.

We would, therefore, remind Judge Grier, in the name of the people, whose servant he is, that such language is not permitted by the judicial decorum of modern times; and that it is particularly unbecoming in an incumbent of the Federal Bench towards a magistrate of a sovereign State.

To counteract the impression made by the singular ebullition, which is the occasion of our remarks, we are requested to state that Gilbert Burrows, Esq., who issued the writ, is a magistrate highly respected at Wilkesbarre, and Mr. Gildersleeve, who made the preliminary affidavit, a merchant in good standing and a worthy citizen.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS.—The Woman's Rights Convention at Cleveland, broke up, on Thursday, Oct. 6th, in a row, under the auspices of the insane virago Abby Kelly. We think there is some truth in the claims of the leaders of this movement; but a few demonstrations of such a character as the above will quiet it effectually. One Convention ending in a scolding match and cap-pulling scrape will do the cause more harm than half a dozen Temperance Conventions will cure, even under the efficient prescriptions of those reliable old school practitioners, Drs. Hewitt and Marsh. Keep your temper, ladies.—F. B. F.—*Hartford Republican.*

The above paragraph had editorial prominence in the paper to which we credit it. The disgraceful allusion to Abby Kelly Foster, one of the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society, is our only apology for noticing it. If we had found it in Bennett's *Herald*, the fit channel for such vituperation, we should have passed it in silence; but its appearance in a paper so respectable and generally so well infortaed as our Free Democratic contemporary of Hartford surprises us not a little. The name of the person at whom our neighbour sneers, as an "insane virago," is Abby Kelly Foster; and when we say that she is one of the noblest and most self-sacrificing women of the age, beloved by all who know her, and a worthy example in all the relations of life, we do her no more than simple justice. She sacrificed her little patrimony to the Anti-Slavery cause, working for a long time in the lecturing field without compensation; and we venture to say that few public lecturers have done more than herself to disseminate sound Anti-Slavery principles. If the *Republican* doubts our testimony in relation to this much-abused woman, let it ask Hon. Charles Allen, of Worcester, where she resides, what is her standing in that city for sanity and moral worth; and as to the value of her Anti-Slavery work, let it consult Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, who has often been heard to say that the sterling quality of the Abolitionism which has kept him so long in Congress is owing, in no small measure, to her faithful and zealous labours. We think that paper should be ashamed of itself for permitting anybody to use its columns for throwing mud at such a woman, for no better reason than that she is abused by the pro-slavery press.

☞ WE insert the following 'prophecy' at the request of a person who assures us of his implicit faith of its coming—through a 'medium'—directly from God himself. However this may be, the prophecy, by this time, ought to be a very good prophecy, for somebody or other has always been making one like it for the last six thousand years.

THE VOICE OF GOD TO THE INHABITANTS OF EARTH!

[*A prophecy—showing the righteous indignation of Jehovah against the tyrannical governments of Earth, especiallly the United States of America, with her institutions of Slavery, &c.*]

"She that sitteth a crown of many jewels among nations, I have marked her with mine eye. I have watched her goings out and her comings in. I will reward her with the reward of her ways.

"As she has forgotten to be righteous in her strength, and hath broken others as a strong man breaketh flax, so will I break her jewels and destroy her crowns, except she turn suddenly to me and repent.

"Man may not grind his brother as the mill-stone grindeth corn. Man may not hold lightly the purity of his sister; he may not tear asunder; he may not despoil or defile the souls that I have made.

"The clouds of mine anger are resting on this people, saith the Lord."

Given July 28th, 1858, in the 4th hour of the day.

THE LIBERTY PARTY.—Such is the name of a small body of persons, of whom Gerrit Smith may, perhaps, not invidiously, be called the leader, and who, agreeing most heartily with the American Anti-Slavery Society in everything else, differ from it in holding the United States Constitution to be an Anti-Slavery instrument. This opinion they hold as honestly, no doubt, as we hold its opposite; and we cannot see that the difference between us can with any reason be made a bar to union in the use of moral means for the overthrow of Slavery. In our aims and purposes, and in our methods for the most part, we are one; especially are we one in repudiating as spurious and loathsome the popular Christianity of this country, and in claiming Jesus Christ as the Prince of Emancipators, and his religion as the friend and solace of the poor and the oppressed, of whatever caste or colour.

Practically, our political views tend also to one and the same result. We go for the dissolution of the Union, because we deem certain provisions of the Constitution immoral and wicked; the Liberty Party gets rid of the difficulty by an interpretation, which, if carried into effect, must infallibly break the Union into fragments. The difference between us, therefore, is one of form rather than substance, and ought not to be magnified into anything else. Let us work together where we can, and differ from each other in kindness where we must.

Recently the Liberty Party held a State Convention at Canastota, Madison County, and adopted an Address, written by Gerrit Smith, setting forth its peculiar views. That our readess may have the means of forming a correct judgment in respect to those views, we propose to publish the said Address in our next number.

MR. MCKIM IN BELFAST.—John R. Neill writes from Belfast, Ireland, to the *Liberator*, under date of Sept. 16th, as follows:

Last week, I had the pleasure of receiving to my house and heart that faithful friend of humanity, J. Miller McKim, of Philadelphia. Need I assure you that my wife and myself found him a simple, true-hearted man? We spent many happy hours in his society; and when he left us, we felt as though we had parted from a friend of many years' standing.

On Monday evening, 12th inst., a social tea meeting of friends of the Anti-Slavery cause, called together for the purpose of meeting our friend and hearing from him his views of the present position and future prospects of the cause in the United States, was held in one of our public rooms; and on Tuesday evening, he was present at two social meetings, the second of which was a meeting of the Ladies' A. S. Sewing circle.

I need not attempt to send you any report of Mr. McKim's addresses on these occasions. They covered the whole question, in its various phases. Much conversation succeeded the addresses, and many questions were asked in regard to the causes of the old secession from the Abolitionist ranks, the difference between moral force and political Abolitionism, the character and opinions of yourself and your supporters, &c &c. The result was most gratifying. Without, in any instance, blinking the question as to your heterodoxy, but rather, in each case, admitting most fully your opposition to the prevalent ideas in regard to the Sabbath, to Calvinism, to the inspiration of the Bible, he yet succeeded, I think, in convincing the persons present that yours is the only Anti Slavery organization that is worthy of their support; and, what in my view was equally important, that, though heterodox in doctrine, you are Christian in spirit and conduct. Mr. McKim's readiness in answering every question, his good temper and gentlemanly bearing, elicted general approval, and, I think, have been rarely equalled by any one in such rather trying circumstances.

Would that we could have at least one such visiter every year among us. It would do great good.

SOUND DOCTRINE.—From the Annual Report of the Weymouth (Mass.) Female Anti-Slavery Society, published in last week's *Liberator*, we copy the following passage, believing it to set forth sound doctrine:

We hold that any church, of any denomination, that refuses the free use of its meeting-house for Anti-Slavery purposes, and is not otherwise engaged, places itself that act in a pro-slavery position. Anti-Slavery Truth is a part, and a most important part, of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. No body of men assuming to be his followers, can make good that claim, whatever their creed, unless *from* that creed, as its necessary sequence, proceed the good works of sympathy and labour for the slave. It is for them to make good the connection between their creed and their life, to say that their Abolition is only the result of their Calvinism, or their Universalism, or their Catholicism, as the case may be. With that results only have the Abolitionists to do. If that be found wanting, it is their duty to say, "Whatever else you may be, you are not Christians."

Now, if all the churches of all the denominations were Anti-Slavery, then would the need of Anti-Slavery Societies be comparatively at an end. The emancipation of the slaves of this country should be the work, *par excellence*, of the American Church. It should be to her what the work of Foreign Missions now is. But the very least and lowest ground that she can with decency assume is cheerful and hearty co-operation with a body aiming to perform her appropriate but abandoned work. One important part of this co-operation is the opening of every meeting-house to its advocates.

THE LITTLE PILGRIM.—We give this paper a cordial greeting. It is the successor of Mrs. Bailey's *Friend of Youth*, and, like that, is to be issued monthly, for the entertainment and instruction of Girls and Boys. The Editor is Grace Greenwood (Sarah Jane Clarke); the publisher, Mr. Leander K. Lippincott. We hope to be pardoned for saying that, before these lines can reach the readers of the *Standard*, there will be a co-partnership between the Editor and the Publisher, far more intimate as well as more sacred than any mere business relation. Our welcome to the *Little Pilgrim*, therefore, is happily blended with the congratulations which a long-standing friendship prompts us to offer to a bridegroom, and with the equally hearty congratulations which our admiration for womanly virtues, and for talent and genius devoted to the service of the young, would prompt us to offer to a bride, if we were not too much a stranger to assume such a privilege. The paper is as excellent in matter as it is beautiful in exterior, and we cannot doubt that its circulation will be immense. Our friends who are in want of such a paper will be glad to learn that the price is only 50 cents, which can easily be remitted by letter, in the shape of two 25 cent pieces. The better plan will be, however, for ten persons to club together, as in that case they will have to pay only $4. Address L. K. Lippincott, Philadelphia.

GEORGE R. GRAHAM, the proprietor of Graham's Magazine, having been unfortunately addicted to habits of intemperance, has recently taken the pledge of total abstinence, and offered himself as an advocate of the temperance cause. The Philadelphia *Register* says:

The pleasantest piece of personal news we have heard these many days. Mr. Graham brings to the cause the manners of a gentleman, and the ability equal to the emergency, while his experience enables him to speak on the subject "as one having authority."

This example cannot fail to strike deeply into the social and convivial circles whereof he has been so long the life and ornament, and there will be many hearts gladdened by *his* adhesion to the cause, and renewed hopes of its early triumph when such as he come up to its aid.

Now, if Mr. Graham would only retract the abuse of Mrs. Stowe and the Abolitionists, with which a pen not his own was permitted to stain the pages of his Magazine, he would put himself upon an honourable footing with many who would like to respect him for what he has been and for what he hopes to be.

VERMONT.—The Legislature assembled on Thursday of last week. After numerous ballotings, Horatio Needham, the candidate of the Free Democracy, was chosen Speaker by a coalition between his own party and the Hunker Democracy. It is probable that the Free Democrats will, in return, help the Slave Democracy elect their candidates for Governor and Lieut. Governor. The United States Senatorship is all in the fog at present.

WILLIAM J. WATKINS, a coloured young man of fine talents, both as a writer and speaker, has become Assistant Editor of *Frederick Douglass's Paper*. We should have noticed this fact more promptly, but the number of Mr. Douglass's paper in which the new arrangement was announced has never reached this office. We hope Mr. Watkins will find his new vocation as pleasant to himself as we are sure it will be useful to his readers and the cause.

☞ PARKER PILLSBURY, in a letter to the *Bugle* from Indiana, speaks of Rev. Dr. Durbin, of the Methodist Church, as a *Southern* man. We think this is a mistake. It certainly is, unless the gentleman has migrated very lately. Last year he was a resident of Philadelphia, and we think he is still a member of the Philadelphia Conference. As to his position on the Slavery question, we presume it does not differ much from that of most Northern Methodist clergymen; but we heard him, in the General Conference of 1844, give Bishop Soule a drubbing which we think that aged defender of Slavery will not soon forget.

NO COPY of the pamphlet containing the Proceedings of the Coloured National Convention, lately held in Rochester, has been received at this office. The omission to send us one was probably an inadvertence.

WE are requested to state that Mr. John J. Kelley, of Boston, will speak on the subject of Slavery in Dr. Pennington's Church, corner of Prince and Marion streets, on Sunday evening next.

THE "man Jerry," who was rescued from the hands of United States Officers at Syracuse, Oct. 1, 1851, died at Kingston, C. W., on the 8th inst.

MUCH IN LITTLE

REV. HENRY GILES has become a regular contributor to the columns of the *Augusta* (Me.) *Age*.

——The Catholics in Russia are at the present time the objects of persecution. Many Catholic priests are subjected to a punishment which is called *plete*, and which has replaced the *knout*. They give blows by thousands. A doctor assists at the execution, and it is he who, when the patient is nearly dead, causes the tortures to be suspended. They let the victim breathe, and sometimes even they carry him to the hospital, but in order to recommence until the sentence be completely executed. One of the priests thus martyred is dead after having received more than nine thousand blows at different repetitions.

——We learn from the *Bugle* that Lucretia Mott, after attending the National Woman's Rights Convention at Cleveland, went to Salem, Columbiana County, Ohio, where she spoke once in Friends' meeting, and twice in the Town Hall, to the edification of those who were so fortunate as to hear her. She afterwards went to Cincinnati, where, in connection with Lucy Stone, and Mrs. Jenkins, of Geneva, she held a large Woman's Rights meeting. Before going to Cleveland, she made a visit to Washington County, in this State, where she held several interesting meetings.

——There is solemn truth in this brief passage from Gilfillan. It would be well if our preachers would all give heed:

How many the preachers who seem to imagine that man's religion, like his life, lies in his nostrils, or who deem that length of visage is a measure for piety and power, or who mistake a compound of clamour and cant for eloquence, or who compound the mere phraseology and technical theological language of our ancestors with their living fire and solemn earnestness! These are the men who disgust and weary the young intelligence of our day, whose sermons present a contrast so striking to the amenities and manly gentilities of our current literature, and who may be said, indeed, unintentionally on their part, to be most masterly pioneers in the road of infidelity.

——Victor Beaumont, a citizen of New York, of French birth, has patented, says the *Tribune*, a printing press, which, at a moderate rate of speed, will deliver *thirty thousand* sheets printed on both sides in a single hour! Its movement combines the original principles of Napier, which are applied by Hoe in his great press, with some new and beautifully simple arrangements and devices of the inventor. It has a large central cylinder like the Hoe press, on which are fastened the forms for both sides of the sheet to be printed. The type are held fast by Hoe's patent column rules. The paper used is a continuous strip or band, dispensing with men to feed the separate sheets as in other power presses. Mr. Hoe, the great manufacturer of presses, has purchased this patent, and will use it at once.

—— Two coloured men—brothers—recently made application to one of the courts at Richmond, Va., asserting that they had so far removed from their original blood as to entitle them to the benefit of an Act of Assembly, which declares that persons with less than one-fourth negro blood shall be considered white persons; and under this plea they claimed the privilege of going abroad without registers. The Court, after hearing arguments on both sides, refused the application. The Richmond *Enquirer* endorses this deicsion, and adds:

The law and circumstances under which this application was made would free about one-fourth of the slaves of the Commonwealth, and lead to interminable difficulties on the subject. One-tenth negro-blood would be little enough to place a negro upon the footing of a white person.

We commend the above statement to the attention of those who fear that emancipation would lead to amalgamation. Here is a confession that one-fourth of the slaves of Virginia are nearly or quite three-fourths white! Probably at least another fourth have only a smaller admixture of Anglo Saxon blood. It is not likely that one-half the slaves of Virginia are of pure African descent! Notwithstanding this illustration of the tastes and affinities of the slaveholders, they have the effrontery to charge Abolitionists with designing to bring about an amalgamation of the white and black races.

——The *Tribune* has started a bold reform—nothing less than the total abolition of the practice of keeping resident ministers at foreign courts. It maintains that such ministers are a useless drain upon the treasury, and that, being appointed, in most cases, as a reward for partisan service at home, they often bring the country into deep disgrace by absurdly aping the manners and customs of royalty. Recently, Mr. Trescott, an American consul at some place which we do not now remember, wrote a letter in defence of the present diplomatic system, urging the importance of increasing the salaries of our foreign ministers, so as to enable them to live on a scale of magnificence worthy of our great country. In a critique of that letter, the *Tribune* says:

Mr. Trescott speaks feelingly. He had a nice place in London. He exchanged billet-doux with Duchesses, drove in the Park, had precedence at all State parades, feeds and frolicks, and had a jolly good time of it, and would doubtless have been transported to have been fastened upon the country up to old age, with a regular scale of honours. This is the old doctrine of the South. It accompanied the Revolution when the South told the North—Do you supply the men and we will the officers. * * * The South controls the North through our doughfaces. Of course, as slaveholders, they go for office, brilliant and imposing, and for liveries the badges of servitude. Our foreign relations are controlled for the most part by the Southern interest, and of course aristocracy has guided the principles and practices of our Legations. A generous word for Republicans and Republican practices must be wanting under such auspices. The Court of England, and all the privileges, paupers and thieves hanging thereunto, costs, with its palaces, upward of Five Millions of Dollars. In harmony with this colossal robbery are the expenses of English Diplomacy. Of course Lord Palmerston, so largely quoted by Mr. Trescott, finds the necessity for diplomats and their huge salaries and palaces overwhelming, and Mr. Trescott being aristocratic finds it so too. But notwithstanding Northern doughfaces, the principles of liberty and equality are spreading. Individualism is rising to the dignity of a social truth. The people are steadily learning self-government. The splendid achievements of private enterprise—the railways that rivet the States in iron bonds of interest—the steamboats that waft courtesies and commodities as though cities floated—the telegraphs that speak with omnipresent divinity—these all are the true representatives of the country. The intercommunication of countries—the rolling waves of foreign immigrants hither and American travellers abroad—all dispense with the cumbrous diplomatic machinery of two centuries ago. We have new means, resources, ideas, and need not wry-necked retrospection to teach us to discover and practice the political economies required for our immediate epoch.

FREEDOM TO SLAVES.—Last week, our townsman, John Fisher, Esq., gave freedom to his entire lot of slaves, five in number, four of whom, with quite as much furniture and money as would satisfy approachable fastidious white folks, removed to Pennsylvania. One of these four was held in the highest estimation by Mr. Fisher, and thousands of dollars would have been no inducement for her sale.—*Westminster* (*Md.*) *Carrolltonian.*

CLOSE OF THE FAIR.—The Crystal Palace Management have fixed no definite date for the closing of the Exhibition, only that it will be during the month of December, and sometime previous to the close of the month.

AN INCIDENT IN MARRIED LIFE.—Some thirteen years since, a couple of loving ones were married a short distance from this city, and soon after the husband went to sea. A few months passed, and the young wife received news that the ship in which her husband had sailed was lost at sea, and all hands had perished. This report was subsequently corroborated. Time rolled on, and after the lapse of some seven years the widow married an industrious and hard-working mechanic, who for a long time past has been and still is employed by a firm in Cornhill. This last marriage proved a happy one to both parties, and matters passed between them as pleasantly as could be desired, until some ten days since, when, to their utter surprise, the first husband of the lady made his appearance and claimed his wife. Legal counsel was consulted by both parties, and the result was, that the lady felt herself compelled to return to her first husband, much to the regret of the second, whose home is now desolate.—*Boston Journal.*

AN ORTHODOX DOG.—Attending meeting last Sabbath evening for the first time at Dr. Chandler's church, in this town, I was much amused to see a large one-eared dog stalk up the aisle near the commencement of the services, and quietly stretch himself out on the pulpit platform. After taking a survey of the congregation, as if probably to see who were absent, he dropped his head and fell into a sound sleep, perhaps thinking that was city style. I afterward learned that this dog was strictly sectarian in his views, having, after mature deliberation, settled down upon the mode of worship as adopted by the Congregationalist order, and chosen the Meadow church as his regular place of meeting. His master is of the Baptist denomination, and attends church in this village. But the dog pins his faith to no one's sleeve. He accompanies his master on the Sabbath to the road that leads to his own chosen place of worship, and there turns away without saying one word to persuade him that his own way is right and all others are wrong. At the intermission he calls on a neighbour, gets his dinner, and attends divine worship again in the afternoon. At the close of service he quietly wends his way homeward, meditating upon the topic of the day, no doubt, and perhaps revolving in his own mind how much more of the true Christian spirit might be shown by professors if they would but do as he does, worship where he chooses and let others do the same without molestation.—*Greenfield Gazette.*

STRAW PAPER.—In the review of the Exhibition of paper at the Crystal Palace, which we publish this morning, is a notice of a new discovery which promises to work a revolution in the production of newspapers as well as of books. We refer to the straw paper of Mr. Mellier, a French chemist and manufacturer. This article is made entirely from straw, and, as we can testify, after a careful examination of specimens of various qualities, is as good as can be made of rags. By a new chemical process, the invention reduces the fibre of straw or other vegetable substance into pulp, which, we believe, is then finished as paper by the ordinary methods. The advantage of the use of straw comes from its exceeding cheapness and abundance. Rags are scarce, and as the demand for paper increases, become dearer, but there is little danger of a short supply of straw. To discover a way of using it for paper has long been desiderated, but until Mr. Mellier, no seeker had found it out. We are informed that his process is simple and cheap, and that when he ceases to claim compensation as patentee for its use, the price of paper cannot but fall very considerably. This will work a revolution in our journals. It will enable those papers which are now printed on small, flimsy and dirty sheets to imitate the example of the *Tribune*, and assume an appearance more worthy of metropolitan journals; and it will enable us to use even better and more substantial paper than that we employ at present. The printing of books will also be cheapened and improved by this great discovery.—*Tribune.*

MARRIED.

HUNT—PARMENTER.—In Cambridge (Mass.), on Tuesday, the 13th of Oct., by the Rev. Fredrick W. Holland, Freeman Hunt, Editor of the Merchants Magazine, of New York, to Miss Elizabeth Thompson Parmenter, daughter of the Hon. William Parmenter, of Cambridge.

DIED.

LEE—On Sunday, Oct. 16, after a long illness, John Lee, Jr., in the 32d year of his age.

WHITE—In Putney, Vt., on the 15th instant, Mrs. Ruth S. White, wife of Rev. Broughton White, and mother of Mary A. W. Johnson, aged 80.

BURGESS—In Providence, R. I., Oct. 13th, Hon. Tristam Burgess, formerly member of Congress, and one of the most eminent men of the State, aged 84.

TWENTIETH

National Anti-Slavery Bazaar.

To be Held in Boston, Mass.,

DURING THE CHRISTMAS WEEK OF 1853.

THE Managers of the NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR, in once more addressing their friends and fellow-labourers, for the purpose of entreating a warmer sympathy and a more effective co-operation in their proposed movement, beg leave to submit a few suggestions which they trust may have a tendency to produce that result.

Twenty years have passed away since the first Fair to aid in the Abolition of American Slavery was held in the City of Boston. Twenty years of labour and effort, and still we remain a slaveholding nation, our first work of repentance in a national capacity yet to be uttered, our first work of mercy yet to be done. But have these labours and efforts, of which we may, properly enough, just now, consider this Bazaar an exponent, accomplished nothing? Only the childishly thoughtless or the wilfully false can venture to reply in the negative.

The battle has not been won; it has not even been fought; but the outposts have been carried, and the field, with its embattled hosts, lies plainly before us. Massacre of the Masters, slaves contented and happy, amalgamation of Races, Colonisation, and similar fallacies—these are the refuges of lies which the Abolitionists have swept away, and the issue between them and their opponents is narrowed to the simple question of material success and self-interest. The creed of the Pro-Slavery party is expressed in two lines,

"That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

The blood-cemented prosperity which should be its shame, is coolly adduced, in argument, as ample justification for continuance in crime.

Hence, no talk of *Gradualism* now obstructs our way. Kindly propositions in its behalf, from distant friends of the slave, ignorant of the essential diabolism which is the animating spirit of the Slave institution of this country, meet, from the Slaveholding South and Pro-Slavery North alike, as bitter and unscrupulous an opposition as was ever meted out to the most energetic demand ever made for Immediate Abolition. The slaveholders understand perfectly that the concessions of marriage, family ties, the Bible, are, in effect, emancipation. They have never been granted where men were held as property, for the very good reason that any such concession lays the axe to the root of so audacious and abominable a claim.

So many sophistries and fallacies being removed, the Abolitionists then may congratulate themselves that they are now in direct collision with the consciences and hearts of the people. In many respects, their chance of success is better than ever before. Another generation is entering upon the duties and responsibilities of life, who, however thoughtless and indifferent to the great question of their age, are not and cannot be as were their fathers when it first met *them*, "in darkness that might be felt," and cased in such armour of prejudice, that Truth herself might well nigh deem them invincible.

The leaders, too, of the Pro-Slavery hosts, alike in the State and the Church, are, day by day, called from their unholy warfare to give their account for the deeds done in the body, and, mercifully, to a very considerable extent, their inhuman influence dies with them. Men may mourn when the confessors of Truth and Mercy depart, but their mantles fall on others; but when the Statesmen who have voted for, and the Ministers who have preached for, the Fugitive Slave Bill, are summoned hence, a crowd of the weak and wavering, who would not have been so base and cruel but for the influence of a firmer and superior mind, breathe freer, are measurably released from their thraldom and rendered accessible to better influences.

The signs of the times abroad as well as at home offer tokens of encouragement. In foreign lands, an agitation has been aroused which will never, we trust, again slumber. Christendom owes it to the name by which it is called to rally on this question. There has never been so vast a one submitted to its consideration; but, God be thanked, its simplicity is equal to its magnitude, and Monarchist and Republican, Catholic and Protestant, nay, though we have spoken of Christendom, Heathendom itself may see written, as with letters of light, on the Heavens, that it is indeed "a wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man," and doubly wild and doubly guilty when this phantasy controls the sentiment and shapes the action of a great and self-governing nation.

Apart from these and other general causes of encouragement, the Managers of the Bazaar, and those co-operating with them, may find special stimulus to exertion in the fact that the present arrangements of the American Anti-Slavery Society are such as to render an increased success of this undertaking more desirable, we might almost say imperative, than ever before.

The Receipts of the Bazaar are devoted to the sustentation of the Parent Society and its organ, the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, in the City of New York. There, in the very focus of pro-slavery opposition, a banner in behalf of the perishing slave has been raised, and its triumph will be in some measure commensurate with the supplies that this movement may be enabled to furnish.

The details of the Bazaar are so well understood that we feel any particular specifications unnecessary.

We cordially invite the assistance of every lover of Freedom, pledging ourselves to all such for a conscientious fulfilment of all the duties that our present position imposes on us.

Donations of any kind, either in manufactured articles, materials for manufacture or money, will be gratefully received by any of the Managers whose names and addresses are subjoined, or any further information that may be requested will be cheerfully given.

Anne Warren Weston, Weymouth, Mass.
Ann Greene Phillips, Essex street, Boston.
Helen E. Garrison, 8 Dix Place, Boston.
Louisa Loring, 27 State street, Boston.
Mary May, 4 Franklin Place, Boston.
Sarah Russell May, Leicester, Mass.
Maria Weston Chapman, care of Messrs. Green & Co., Paris, France.
Caroline Weston, " "
Mary Gray Chapman.
Henrietta Sargent, 156 Tremont street, Boston.
Frances Mary Robbins, Brush Hill, Milton.
Eliza Lee Follen.
Susan C. Cabot.
Thankful Southwick, Danvers, Mass.
Sarah H. Southwick, Portland, Maine.
Caroline F. Williams, 75 Southac street, Boston.
Mary H. Jackson, 1071 Washington street, Boston.
Elizabeth Gay, 142 Nassau street, New York.
Charlotte S. Sargent, 70 Dover street, Boston

Miscellaneous Department.

A NEW LIFE OF POPE.

[A review, from the London *Examiner*, of the first volume of a new edition of the Poetical Works of Alexander Pope, by Robert Carruthers.]

It pleases us to see books of this kind find a place among libraries of cheap and popular reading, for we hold very much with the good king of Arragon, who liked old wood to burn, old wine to drink, old friends to converse with, and old books to read. In another sense it may be doubted, to be sure, if a really good book can ever be an old book. It lives because it does *not* grow old. Here, for example, is Pope, looking out as keenly and freshly on our world of railways and steamers, with his lean earnest face and beautiful eyes, as he ever looked with love or hate at Lady Mary Montagu. In him we have the perfection of a particular kind of poetry, which nobody has carried farther since his time. In all these hundred and odd years there has appeared no claimant for higher honours. In wit, in fancy, in the combination of sense and feeling, in personal satire and diviner personal compliment—in refined sentiment, and the most delicate succinctness of expression; above all, in a subtle power of bringing the creative part of imagination to wait on the most obvious graces that encirole ordinary life, Pope stands apart in English literature. His weakness as well as his strength tended all in one direction. Greater natural poets have sprung up—masters of mightier passion and more exuberant fancy—but the sylphs that fan Belinda's coffee have had no superiors or rivals; and never has poetry had the devotion of a sensibility so keen and true, guided by reflective powers so well balanced, or an understanding so carefully cultivated.

No part of the poetry is yet before us in this edition; but Mr. Carruthers shows us, by the judicious tone and manner of his biographical sketch, that he is likely to prove a very good editor. He gives an outline of the facts, neither carping like Bowles nor panegyrizing like Roscoe, but criticising the statements of both biographers with much discreetness, contributing even a new illustration now and then, and making excellent occasional use of the poet's letters. Such of the latter as are thus extracted we have read with renewed pleasure, and we must repeat, what more than once we have said in this journal, that Pope's letters, notwithstanding an artificiality of tone in some of them, and a too great elaboration and nicety of expression, are for the most part thoroughly true in feeling, as well as masterly in wit and style.

How exquisite is the close of this letter to Lady Mary, in which he describes the rustic lovers struck suddenly dead by lightning! We mean the second of his descriptions of that incident, the first of which is commonly but erroneously given to Gay.

"Upon the whole, I can't think these people unhappy. The greatest happiness, next to living as they would have done, was to die as they did. The greatest honour people of this low degree could have was to be remembered on a little monument; unless you will give them another—that of being honoured with a tear from the finest eyes in the world. I know you have tenderness; you must have it: it is the very emanation of good sense and virtue. The finest minds, like the finest metals, dissolve the easiest."

Continually such touches as this occur:

"I think the way to have a public spirit is first to to have a private one; for who can believe (said a friend of mine) that any man can care for a hundred thousand people, who never cared for one? No ill-humoured man can ever be a patriot any more than a friend."

With what wisdom and unaffectedness he writes to Atterbury, who wanted sorely to try his hand at a conversion:

"Your lordship has formerly advised me to read the best controversies between the churches. Shall I tell you a secret? I did so at fourteen years old (for I loved reading, and my father had no other books): there was a collection of all that had been written on both sides in the reign of King James II. I warmed my head with them; and the consequence was that I found myself a Papist and a Protestant by turns, according to the last book I read. I am afraid most seekers are in the same case; and, when they stop, they are not so properly converted as outwitted. You see how little glory you would gain by my conversion. And, after all, I verily believe your lordship and I are both of the same religion, if we were thoroughly understood by one another, and that all honest and reasonable Christians would be so, if they did but talk enough together every day; and had nothing to do together but to serve God, and to live in piece with their neighbour."

But, above all, how beatiful is this last of Pope's letters to Swift! We are to remember, too, that it was written after the Dean had refused to comply with one of his requests, and treated him not quite fairly in respect to it.

"My Dear Friend—When the heart is full of tenderness, it must be full of concern at the absolute impotency of all words to come up to it. You are the only man now in the world who costs me a sigh every day of my life, and the man it troubles me most, although I most wish to write to. Death has not used me worse in separating from me for ever poor Gay, Arbuthnot, &c., than disease and absence in separating you so many years. But nothing shall make me forget you, and I am persuaded you will as little forget me; and most things in this world one may afford to forget, if we remember and are remembered by our friends. I value and enjoy more the memory of the pleasures and endearing obligations I have formerly received from you, than the perfect possession of any other. I am less anxious every day I live for present enjoyments of any sort, and my temper of mind is calmer as to worldly disappointments and accidents, except the loss of friends by death, the only way (I thank God) that I ever have lost any. Think it not possible that my affection can cease but with my last breath. If I could think yours was alienated, I should grieve, but not reproach you. If I felt myself even hurt by you, I should be confident you knew not the blow you gave, but had your hand guided by another. If I never more had a kind word from you, I should feel my heart the same as it has ever been towards you.

"I must confess al ate incident has given me some pain: but I am satisfied you were persuaded it would not have given me any. And whatever unpleasant circumstances the printing our letters might be attended with, there was *one* that pleased me—that the strict friendship we have born each other so long is thus made known to all mankind. As far as it was your will I cannot be angry at what in all other respects I am quite uneasy under. Had you asked me before you gave them away, I think I could have proposed some *better monument* for our friendship, or at least of better materials; and you must allow me to say, this was not my erecting but yours. My part of them is far too mean, and how inferior to what you have ever in your works set up to me! And can I see these without shame when I reflect on the many beautiful, pathetic, and amiable lines of yours, which carry to posterity the name of a man who, if he had not every good quality which you so kindly ascribe to him, would be so proud of none as the constancy and the justice of his esteem for you? Adieu! While I can write, speak, remember, or think, I am yours, A. Pope."

We cannot resist one more extract from these letters; it is the most *made-up* perhaps of any of them, but remarkably pleasant, and quite true in the light it throws on the literary profession in Pope's time, and the men who in those days had the regulating of it. Pope describes to Lord Burlington how, as he was riding to Oxford, he was overtaken by bookseller Lintot, also mounted:

"Mr. Lintot began in this manner: 'Now, damn them! what if they should put it into the newspaper how you and I went together to Oxford? what would I care? If I should go down into Sussex, they would say I was gone to the Speaker. But what of that? If my son were big enough to go on with the business, by G—d I would keep as good company as old Jacob.'

"Hereupon I inquired of his son. 'The lad,' says he, 'has fine parts, but is somewhat sickly, much as you are—I spare for nothing in his education at Westminster. Pray, do not you think Westminster to be the best school in England? Most of the late ministry came out of it, so did many of this ministry. I hope the boy will make his fortune.'

"'Do not you design to let him pass a year at Oxford?' 'To what purpose?' said he. 'The universities do but make pedants, and I intend to breed him a man of business.'

"As Mr. Lintot was talking, I observed he sat uneasy on his saddle, for which I expressed some solicitude. 'Nothing,' says he: 'I can bear it well enough; but since we have the day before us, methinks it would be very pleasant for you to rest awhile under the woods.' When we were alighted, See here, what a mighty pretty Horace I have in my pocket! what if you amused yourself in turning an ode till we mount again? Lord! if you pleased, what a clever miscellany might you make at leisure hours!' Perhaps I may, said I, if we ride on; the motion is an aid to my fancy; a round trot very much awakens my spirits. Then jog on apace, and I will think as hard as I can.

"Silence ensued for a full hour; after which Mr. Lintot lugged the reins, stopped short, and broke out, 'Well, sir, how far have you gone?' I answered, Seven miles. 'Z—ds, sir,' said Lintot, 'I thought you had done seven stanzas Oldsworth, in a ramble round Wimbledon hill, would translate a whole ode in half this time. I will say that for Oldsworth (though I lost by his Timothy's), he translates an ode of Horace the quickest of any man in England. I remember Dr. King would write verses in a tavern three hours after he could not speak; and there is Sir Richard, in that rumbling old chariot of his, between Fleet ditch and St. Giles's pond, shall make you half a job.'

"Pray, Mr. Lintot (said I), now you talk of translators, what is your method of managing them? 'Sir,' replied he, 'those are the saddest pack of rogues in the world; in a hungry fit they will swear they understand all the languages in the universe. I have known one of them take down a Greek book upon my counter, and cry, Ah, this is Hebrew; I must read it from the latter end. By G—d! I can never be sure in these fellows, for I neither understand Greek, Latin, French, nor Italian myself. But this is my way: I agree with them for ten shillings per sheet, with a proviso, that I will have their doings corrected by whom I please; so by one or other they are led at last to the true sense of an author, my judgment giving the negative to all my translators.' But how are you secure those correctors may not impose upon you? 'Why, I get any civil gentlemen (especially any Scotchman) that comes into my shop, to read the original to me in English; by this I know whether my first translator be deficient, and whether my corrector merits his money or not.'"

In regard to the publication of the letters and the Curll dispute, perhaps Mr. Carruthers states the case somewhat too strongly against Pope; and in one or two other matters he hardly makes allowance sufficient. Of one thing we are quite certain, that the insinuation of the poet's having received a bribe from the Duchess of Marlborough to suppress what he afterwards deliberately left for publication *cannot* be true. On the other hand, the editor of this book describes the Addison quarrel very fairly, and we shall quote the passage of the memoir which contains the first draft of the immortal verses it provoked. The reader will remember that contemporaneously with Pope's first volume of his *Homer*, Tickell published the first book of the *Iliad*, as part of a proposed translation by himself:

"One word from Addison could have made Tickell withhold his translation, but that word was not spoken. He had not indeed urged a subscription for his friend's work, which, if opened in time, might have proved seriously injurious to Pope; but the publication of Tickell's volume, with the praises of Addison, echoed by all the Whigs at Button's, betrayed indifference to Pope's interests and feelings, and might justly inspire a poet so sensitive with suspicion and resentment. Addison had thrice before, as Pope conceived, done him disservice. He had censured the 'strokes of ill nature' in his Essay on Criticism; he had written a gratuitous letter to Lintot condemning Pope's method of treating Dennis; and he had indirectly preferred Philip's Pastorals. To these were now added his supposed contrivance with Tickell in undermining that source from which all his hopes of fortune and independence were to be derived—that bold yet toilsome and anxious undertaking, which was to crown him with unfading laurels, or blight his rising and envied reputation.

'This push
Will cheer me ever or disseat me now.'

"Within one month after the publication of his first volume, Pope's resentment burst forth against Addison. On the 15th of July, he wrote to Craggs, inveighing against the 'little Senate of Cato,' and stating that Tickell, the 'humblest slave' that Addison had, translated Homer to gratify the inordinate desires of *one man* only, that man 'a great Turk in poetry, who can never bear a brother on the throne,' and who had a set of mutes, nodders, winkers, and whisperers, whose business it was to strangle all other offsprings of wit in their birth! The sentiments and imagery in this letter to Craggs were embodied in that famous satire—immortal as the English language—which Pope first published in this form in the Miscellanies of 1727:

"'Peace to all such! but were there one whose Fires
Apollo kindled and fair *Fame* inspires,
Blessed with each Talent, and each Art to please,
And born to write, converse, and live with Ease;
Should such a Man, too fond to rule alone,
Bear, like the *Turk*, no brother near the throne;
View him with scornful, yet with fearful Eyes,
And hate for Arts that caused himself to rise;
Damn with faint Praise, assent with civil Leer,
And without sneering teach the rest to sneer;
Wishing to wound, and yet afraid to strike,
Just hint a Fault, and hesitate Dislike;
Alike reserved to blame, or to commend,
A tim'rous Foe, and a suspicious Friend.
Dreading ev'n Fools, by Flatterers besieged,
And so obliging that he ne'er obliged;
Who, if two Wits on rival Themes contest,
Approves of each, but likes the worst the best:
Like *Cato* gives his *little Senate* Laws,
And sits attentive to his own Applause;
While Wits and Templars ev'ry Sentence raise,
And wonder with a foolish Face of Praise.
What Pity, Heaven! if such a man there be,
Who would not weep if *A——n* were he?'

"The name of 'Atticus' was afterwards substituted for 'A——n,' and some verbal corrections were made; but the most important alteration in this memorable satire was the omission of the lines we have printed in italics, which show that, up to 1727, Pope believed, whatever casual suspicions he might throw out, that Tickell was really the author of the translation that bore his name. How he came afterwards to adopt the opinion that the translation was Addison's is imperfectly explained in the poet's conversations with Spence."

We did not before know what is mentioned in the subjoined extract, and we must confess that we entertain some doubts respecting it.

"Thomson's residence in Kew lane was convenient of access, and he frequently paid the easy, good-humoured poet a visit. Mr. Mitford possesses an interleaved copy of the Seasons (of the edition of 1736), containing numerous alterations and additions, in Pope's handwriting, all of which were adopted by Thomson. One of these is eminently beautiful, and leads us to regret that Pope had not cultivated blank verse. In Thomson's episode of Palæmon and Lavinia were these lines:

"'Thoughtless of beauty, she was Beauty's self,
Recluse among the close [deep] embowering woods,
As in the hollow breast of Appenine,
Beneath the shelter of encircling hills,
A myrtle rises far from human eyes,
And breathes its balmy fragrance o'er the wild;
So flourished, blooming and unseen by all,
The sweet Lavinia, till at length compelled
By strong necessity's supreme command,
With smiling patience in her looks, she went
To glean Palæmon's fields.'"

"Pope drew his pen through these lines, and wrote the passage as it now stands:

"'Thoughtless of beauty, she was Beauty's self,
Recluse among the woods, by nature led,
As in the hollow breast of Appenine,
Beneath the shelter of encircling hills,
A myrtle rises far from human eyes,
And breathes its balmy fragrance o'er the wild;
So flourished, blooming and unseen by all,
The sweet Lavinia, till at length compelled
By strong necessity's supreme command,
With smiling patience in her looks, she went
To glean Palæmon's fields.'

Mr. Carruthers has had access to the originals of Margaret and Theresa Blount's letters—but nothing important is added to our previous knowledge of them or their writers, and we do not think the description of their intercourse with Pope the happiest portion of the volume. From the general remarks at the close we take an interesting passage:

"Mr. Rogers remembers an old shopman of Cadell the publisher relating the following incident illustrative of Pope's personal appearance in his latter years. 'One morning, as I was visiting a friend at Twickenham, and walking in one of the lanes there, we met a thin little man in a suit of rusty black, and cocked hat, who walked with difficulty. My friend's son, a boy, who was with us, exclaimed, "Poor man!" "Poor man!" interrupted the senior, "that is no poor man; it is the great Mr. Alex. Pope." He was always at Twickenham called Mr. *Alex.* Pope, probably because there was some other Mr. Pope in the village.' Like Dryden, Pope took snuff; but we are not told that he was not so particular about this luxury as the elder bard, who prepared it himself after some peculiar fashion of his own. In his epistle to Bolingbroke, Pope says:

"'You laugh, half beau, half sloven, if I stand,
My wig all powder, and all snuff my hand.'

But when he went abroad or received company he was as particular and precise in his dress as he was in his poetry. With regard to his small person, that fertile topic with his enemies, the dunces and censors (including even Lady Mary), we need only quote Pope's own description of it in his history of the Little Club, in the Guardian for June 26. 1713: 'Dick Distich we have elected President, not only as he is the shortest of us all, but because he has entertained so just a sense of his stature as to go generally in black, that he may appear yet less; nay, to that perfection is he arrived that he stoops as he walks. The figure of the man is odd enough; he is a lively little creature, with long arms and legs: a spider is no ill emblem of him; he has been taken at a distance for a small windmill.' But though he could bring himself occasionally to jest on his little misshapen figure, Pope was exceedingly sensitive regarding the caricatures of his enemies. No injury was held more atrocious than

'The libell'd person and the pictured shape.'

His 'effigies' were generally in the form of a monkey in a library, holding a pen in his hand, and leaning on a pile of books. None of them, however, defranded him of his best feature, the quick, piercing eye.

"The poet's household was managed with exemplary care and economy. Prudence has been pronounced a pharisaical virtue not much in favour with poets; but Pope was an exception to the careless irregularity of the tuneful tribe. His income was about £800 per annum, arising from life annuities purchased after the Homer subscription, from three or four thousand pounds left him by his father, and from the sale of his works. He is said to have given away, like Swift, a tenth of his income in charity. His liberality to Savage has been already mentioned, and Johnson states that he assisted Dodsley, when the latter commenced bookseller, with a hundred pounds. He loved to entertain his friends at Twickenham, though, if we may credit Johnson's information, there was something of ostentatious meanness in his hospitality, 'as, when he had two guests in his house, he would set at supper a single pint of wine upon the table, and having taken himself two small glasses, would retire and say, "Gentlemen, I leave you to your wine."' This statement receives some countenance from an expression in one of the Duchess of Queensbury's letters to Swift: 'The Duke,' she says, 'is very much yours, *and will never leave you to your wine.*' Swift, who indulged liberally in the use of wine, had probably complained of his host at Twickenham, though he loved him with the affection of a brother. Pope's weakness, and his custom of early rising, made him a bad after-dinner companion. 'He nodded in company,' says Johnson, 'and once slumbered at his own table, while the Prince of Wales was talking of poetry.' This drowsiness was an early peculiarity, characteristic of him in society before he was thirty; but Frederick's disquisition on poetry was probably soporific enough to set any poet asleep. To see Pope to advantage, he must have been seen in the morning, warmed by the genial rays of the sun—'the load of yesterday left behind'—after receiving a letter from Martha Blount, or while conversing with a chosen few ('envy must own I live among the great') in his own laurel circus and winding walks, or in the gardens and pleasure-grounds of his distinguished friends."

Perhaps there exists no better description of the poet in a few words than was given by Thompson's hair-dresser. After saying that when Pope called on his brother poet, he usually wore a light-coloured great coat, which he kept on in the house, the barber went on to say: *He was a strange, ill-formed little figure of a man; but I have heard him talk that that I could have listened to him forever!*

SLANG.

It has been a pleasant conceit with philosophers and writers to distinguish the successive ages of what, in the plenitude of their wisdom, they call the world, by some metallic nickname. We have had the Golden Age, and the Silver age, the Age of Iron, and the Age of Bronze; this present era will, perhaps, be known to our grandchildren as the age of Electro-plating, from its general tendency to shams and counterfeits; and, when the capital of the Anglo-Saxon Empire shall be, some hundreds of years hence, somewhere in the South Seas, or in the centre of Africa or interior of China, the age that is to come may be known as the Age of Platina or that of Potassium, or some one of the hundreds of new metals, which will, of course, be discovered by that time.

However, this present age may be distinguished by future generations, whether ferruginously, or auriferously, or argentially, there can be no doubt that the Victorian era will be known hereafter—and anything but favourably, I surmise—as an epoch of the most unscrupulous heterodoxy in the application of names. What was once occasionally tolerated as a humorous aberration, afterwards degenerated into folly and perversity, and is now a vice and a nuisance. Without the slightest regard to the proprieties of nomenclature, or to what I may call the unities of signification, we apply names to objects, abstractions, and persons stupidly, irrationally and inconsistently: completely ignoring the nature, the quality, the gender, the structure of the thing, we prefix to it a name which not only fails to convey an idea of what it materially is, but actually obscures and mystifies it. A persistance in such a course must inevitably tend to debase, and corrupt that currency of speech which it has been the aim of the greatest scholars and publicists, from the days of Elizabeth downwards, to elevate, to improve, and to refine; and, if we continue the reckless and indiscriminate importation and incorporation into our language of every cant term of speech from the columns of American newspapers, every Canvas Town epithet from the vocabularies of gold-diggers, every bastard classicism dragged head and shoulders from a lexicon by an advertising tradesman to puff his wares, every slip-slop Gallicism from the shelves of the circulating library; if we persist in yoking Hamlets of adjectives to Hecubas of nouns, the noble English tongue will become, fifty years hence, a mere dialect of colonial idioms, enervated ultramontanisms and literate slang. The fertility of a language may degenerate into the feculence of weeds and tares: should we not rather, instead of raking and heaping together worthless novelties of expression, endeavour to weed, to expurgate, to epurate; to render, once more, wholesome and pellucid that which was once a "well of English undefiled," and rescue it from the sewerage of verbiage and slang? Should we not, instead of dabbling and dirtying the stream, endeavour to imitate those praiseworthy men of letters who, at Athens, in that most miserable and forlorn capital of the burlesque kingdom of Greece have laboured, in the face of discountenance, indifference, and a foreign court, to clear the Greek language from the barbarisms of words and phrases, Venetian, Genoese, French, Lingua Franca, Arabic, Turkish, Armenian, Spanish, Sclavonic, Teutonic which, in the course of successive centuries of foreign domination and oppression, had crept into it; and now (though in the columns of base-priced newspapers, printed on rotten paper with broken type) give the debates of a venal chamber, and the summary of humdrum passing events, in the language of Plato and Socrates. These men have done more good and have raised a more enduring monument to their country, than if they had reared again every column of the Acropolis, or brought back every fragment of the Elgin marbles from Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury.

It is no excuse for this word-sinning of ours to say, that we have learned a great portion of our new-fangled names and expressions from America. The utterer is as bad as the coiner. It is true that our trans-atlantic cousins have not only set us the example, but have frequently surpassed us in their eagerness to coin new words, and to apply names to things with which they have not the remotest relation. The Americans call New York the "empire city," as if a city—and in a republic moreover—could be under any circumstances an empire. Another town of theirs is the "crescent city," and so fond of the name of city are they, that they frequently apply it to a group of half-a-dozen log cabins and a whiskey shop in a marsh, on the banks of some muddy fever-haunted river. Every speculator in "town lots" (slang again) in the States has founded half-a-dozen such "cities."

In the United States it half-a-dozen newspaper editors, post-masters, and dissenting ministers, two or three revolvers, a bowie knife, a tooth-pick, and a plug of tobacco get together in the bar-room of an hotel, the meeting is forthwith called a "caucus" or a "mass meeting." If Joel J. Wainwright blows out General Zebedee Ruffle's brains on the New Orleans levee, it is not murder but a "difficulty." In South America, if a score of swarthy outlaws—calling themselves generals and colonels, and who were muleteers the week before—meet in an outhouse to concert the assassination of the dictator of the republic (who may have been the landlord of a *venta* or a hide jobber a year ago), the ragged conclave calls itself a "*pronunciamento*."

And touching the use of the terms, "monster," "mammoth," "leviathan," how very trying have those misplaced words become! Their violent transformation from substantives into adjectives is the least of their wrongs; the poor harmless animals have been outraged in a hundred ways besides. The monster, I believe, first become acquainted with a meeting in connection with that great agitator, so calm now in Glasnevin cemetry, and whose agitation has been followed by such a singular tranquility and apathy in the land he agitated. As something possibly, but not necessarily expressing hugeness (for the most diminutive objects may be monstrous) the term of monster was not inappliocable. But in a very few months every re-union of four-and-twenty fiddlers in a row was dobbed a monster concert; a loaf made with a double allowance of dough was a mouster loaf; every confectioner's new year's raffle was a monster twelfth cake; we had monster slop-selling shops, and the monster pelargonium drove our old familiar friend, the enormous gooseberry, from the field. Then came the mammoth. An American speculator—who in the days when spades are spades, would have been called a showman, but who called himself a "professor and a tiger king," neither of which he was—had a horse, some hands above the ordinary standard of horse-flesh, and forthwith called him the mammoth horse. That obsolete animal the Mammoth being reputed to have been of vast dimensions, gave to the horse this new nickname; but in a short time there started up from all quarters of the Anglo-Saxon globe, from the sky, the earth, and from the waters under the earth, a plethora of mammoths. The wretched antediluvian beast was made to stand godfather to unnumbered things that crawled, and things that crept, and things that had life, and things that had not. The mammoth caves of Kentucky howled from across the Atlantic. Peaceable tradesman hung strange signs and wonders over their shop doors; and we heard of mammoth dust pans, and mammoth loo tables, and mammoth tea trays. Large conger eels, fruits of unusual growth, and cheeses made considerably larger than was convenient, were exhibited in back streets at sixpence a head, under the false pretence of being mammoths. If anybody made anything, or saw anything, or wrote anything big, it became a mammoth, that the credulous might suppose the Titans, Anak and all his sons, were come again, and that there were giants in the land. We wait patiently for a plesiosaurus pumpkin, or an ichtyosaurus hedgehog; and we shall have them in good time, together with leviathan lap-dogs, behemoth butterflies, and great-sea-serpent parliamentary speeches.

Brigands, burglars, beggars, imposters, and swindlers will have their slang jargon to the end of the chapter. Mariners too, will use the terms of their craft, and mechanics will borrow from the technical vocabulary of their trade. And there are cant words and terms traditional in schools and colleges, and in the playing of games, which are orally authorised if not set down in written lexicography. But so universal has the use of slang terms become, that, in all societies, they are frequently subtituted for, and have almost usurped the place of wit. An audience will sit in a theatre and listen to a string of brilliant witticisms, with perfect immobility; but let some fellow rush forward and roar out "It's all serene," or "Catch 'em alive, oh!" (this last is sure to take) pit, boxes, and gallery roar with laughter.

I cannot find much tendency to the employment of slang in the writings of our early humourists. Setting aside obsolete words and phrases rendered obscure by involution, there are not a hundred incomprehensible terms in all Shakspeare's comedies. The glut of commentators to the paucity of disputed words is the best evidence of that. We can appreciate the humor of Butler, the quaintness of Fuller, the satire of Dryden, the wit of Congreve and Wycherly, nay, even the scurrilities of Mr. Tom Brown, as clearly as though they had been written yesterday. In Swift's Polite Conversation, among all the homely and familiar sayings there is no slang; and you may be sure, if there had been any of that commodity floating about in polite circles then, the Dean would have been the man to dish it up for posterity. Fielding and Smollett, in all their pictures of life, with all their coarseness and indecency, put little slang into the mouths of their characters. Even Mr. Jonathan Wild the great, who, from his position and antecedents, must have been a master of slang in every shape, makes but little use of it in his conversation. And in that rogue's epic—that *biographia flagitiosa*—the Beggars' Opera we can understand Macheath, Filch, Jenny Diver, and Mat of the Mint without dictionary or glossary. The only man who wrote slang was Mr. Ned Ward; but that worthy cannot be taken as an exemplar of the polite, or even of the ordinary conversation of his day.

It may be objected to me that although there may be a large collection of slang words floating about, they are made use of only by loose, or at best illiterate persons, and are banished from refined society. This may be begging the question, but I deny the truth of the objection. If words not to be found in standard dictionaries, not authorized by writings received as classics, and for which no literary or grammatical precedents can be adduced are to be called slang—I will aver that you shall not read one single parliamentary debate as reported in a first-class newspaper, without meeting with scores of slang words. Whatever may be the claims of the Commons' House to collective wisdom, it is as a whole an assembly of educated gentlemen. From Mr. Speaker in his chair to the Cabinet ministers whispering behind it—from mover to seconder, from true blue protectionists to extremest radical, Mr. Barry's New House echoes and re-echoes with slang. You may hear slang every day in term from barristers in their robes, at every mess table, at every bar mess, at every college commons, in every club dining room.

Thus, with great modesty and profound submission, I must express my opinion either that slang should be proscribed, banished, prohibited, or that a New Dictionary should be compiled, in which all the slang terms now in use among educated men, and made use of in publications of established character,, should be registered, etymologised, explained, and stamped with the lexicographic stamp, that we may have chapter and verse, mint and hall-mark for our slang. Let the new dictionary contain a well-digested array of the multitude of synonyms for familiar objects floating about; let them give a local habitation and a name to all the little by-blows of language skulking and rambling about our speech, like the ragged little Bedouins about our shameless streets, and give them a settlement and a parish. If the evil of slang has grown too gigantic to be suppressed, let us at least give it decency by legalising it; else, assuredly, this age will be branded by posterity with the shame of jabbering a broken dialect in preference to speaking a nervous and dignified language; and our wits will be sneered at, and undervalued as mere word-twisters, who supplied the lack of humour by a vulgar facility of low language.

The compiler of such a dictionary would have no light task. I can imagine him at work in the synonymous department. Only consider what a vast multitude of equivalents the perverse ingenuity of our slanginess has invented for the one generic word Money. Money—the bare, plain, simple word itself—has a sonorous, significant ring in its sound, and might have sufficed, yet we substitute for it—tin, rhino, blunt, rowdy, stumpy, dibbs, browns, stuff, ready, mopusses, shiners, dust, chips, chinkers, pewter, horsenails, brads. Seventeen synonyms to one word; and then we come to species—pieces of money. Sovereigns are yellow-boys, cooters, quids; crown-pieces are bulls and cart-wheels; shillings, bobs, or benders; sixpenny-pieces are fiddlers and tizzies; fourpenny pieces, joeys or bits; pence, browns, or coppers and mags. To say that a man is without money, or in poverty, some persons remark that he is down on his luck, hard up, stumped up, in Queer Street, under a cloud, up a tree, quisby, done up, sold up, in a fix. To express that he is rich, we say that he is warm, comfortable, that he has feathered his nest, that he has lots of tin, or that he has plenty of stuff, or is worth a plum.

For the one word drunk, besides the authorised synonyms tipsy, inebriated, intoxicated, I find of unauthorised or slang equivalents the astonishing number of thirty-two, viz: in liquor, disguised therein, lushy, boaky, buffy, boozy, mops and brooms, half-seas-over, far-gone, tight, not able to see a hole through a ladder, three sheets in the wind, foggy, screwed, hazy, sewed up, mooney, muddled, muxxy, swipey, lumpy, obfuscated, muggy, beery, winey, slewed, on the ran-tan, on the re-raw, groggy, ploughed, cut, and in his cups.

For one article of drink, gin, we have ten synonyms: max, juniper, gatter, duke, jackey, tape, blue-ruin, cream of the valley, white satin, old Tom.

Synonymous with a man, are a cove, a chap, a cull, an article, a codger, a buffer. A gentleman is a swell, a nob, a tiptopper; a low person is a snob, a sweep, and a scarf, and in Scotland, a gutter-blood. Thieves are pries, cracksmen, mouchers, gonophs, go-alongs. To steal is to prig, to pinch, to collar, to nail, to grab, to nab. To go or run away is to hook it, to bolt, to take tracks, to abequatulate, to slope, to step it, to mizzle, to paddle, to cut, to cut your stick, to evaporate, to vamose, to be off, to vanish, and to tip your rags a gallop. For the verb to beat I can at once find fourteen synonyms; thus, to thrash, to lick, to leather, to hide, to tan, to larrup, to wallop, to pummel, to whack, to whop, to towel, to maul, to quilt, to pay. A horse is a nag, a prad, a tit, a screw. A donkey is a moke, a neddy. A policeman is a peeler, a bobby, a crusher; a soldier a swaddy, a lobster, a red herring. To pawn is to spout, to pop, to lumber, to blue. The hands are mauleys, and the fingers flippers. The feet are steppers; the boots crabshells, or trotter-cases, or grabbers. Food is grub, prog, and crug; a hackney cab is a shofal; a Punch's show a schwaseleboz; a five pound note is a flimsy; a watch a ticker; anything of good quality or character is stunning, ripping, out-and-out; a magistrate is a beak, and a footman a flunkey. Not less can I set down as slang the verbiage by which coats are transformed into bis-uniques, alpacas, vicunas, ponchos, anaxandrians, and siphonias.

The slang expressions I have herein set down I have enumerated, exactly as they have occurred to me, casually. If I had made research, or taxed my memory for any considerable time, I have no doubt that I could augment the slang terms and synonyms to at least double their amount. And it is possible that an accomplished public will be able to supply from their own recollection and experience a goodly addition to my list. The arrival of every mail, the extension of every colony, the working of every Australian mine would swell it. Placers, squatters, diggers, clearings, nuggets, cradles, claims—where were all these words a dozen years ago? and what are they, till they are marshalled in a dictionary, but slang? We may say the same of the railway phraseology: buffers, switches, points, stokers, and coal bunks—whence is their etymology, and whence their authority?

But slang does not end here. It goes higher—to the very top of the social Olympus. If the Duchess of Downderry invites some dozen of her male and female fashionable acquaintances to tea and a dance afterwards, what do you think she calls her tea-party? A *thé dansante*—a dancing tea. Does tea dance? Can it dance? Is not this libel upon honest Bohea and Souchong slang? pure, unadulterated, unmitigated slang.

The slang of the fashionable world is mostly imported from France; an unmeaning gibberish of Gallicisms runs through English fashionable conversation, and fashionable novels, and accounts of fashionable parties in the fashionable newspapers. Yet, ludriciously enough, immediately the fashionable magnates of England seize on any French idiom, the French themselves not only universally abandon it to us, but positively repudiate it altogether from their idiomatic vocabulary. If you were to tell a well-bred Frenchman that such and such an aristocratic marriage was on the *tapis*, he would stare with astonishment, and look down on the carpet in the startled endeavour to find a marriage in so unusual a place. If you were to talk to him of the *beau monde*, he would imagine you meant the world which God made, not half-a-dozen streets and squares between Hyde Park Corner and Chelsea Bun House. The *the dansante* would be completely inexplicable to him. If you were to point out to him the Dowager Lady Grimguffin acting as *chaperon* to Lady Amanda Creamville, he would imagine you were referring to the *petit Chaperon Rouge*—to little Red Riding Hood. He might just understand what was meant by *vis-a-vis*, *entremets*, and some others of the flying horde of frivolous little foreign slangisms hovering about fashionable cookery and fashionable furniture; but three-fourths of them would seem to him as barbarous French provincialisms, or, at best, but as antiquated and obsolete expressions picked up out of the letters of Mademoiselle Scuderi, or the tales of Cribillon the younger.

But, save us, your ladyship, there are thousands of Englishmen who might listen to your ladyship for an hour without understanding half-a-dozen words of your discourse. When you speak of the last *faux pas*, of poor Miss Limberfoot's sad *mesalliance*, of the Reverend Mr. Chaudlecup's being "so full of soul," of the enchanting *roulades* of that ravishing *cantatrice* Martinuzzi, of your dinner of the day before being *recherche*, of your *gens* being insolent and inattentive, how shall plain men refrain from staring wonderstruck at your unfathomable discourse?

And when your ladyship *does* condescend to speak English, it is only with a delightful mincingness of accent and a liberal use of superlatives. The Italian singer you heard last night was a "divine creature;" if you are slightly tired or dull you are "awfully bored" or "devoured with *ennui*;" if your face be pale you vow you are a "perfect fright;" if a gentleman acquaintance volunteer a very mild joke he is a "quizzical monster"—a dreadful quiz, he is so awfully satirical; and the comic actor last night was "killing;" and Julie, my child, hand me my *vinaigrette*, and take a shilling out of my *portemonnaie*, and tell Adolfe to get some *jujubes* for Fido; and, let me see, if I go out in the pilentum to-day, or stay, the barouche (we have a *char-a-banc* down at our place, Doctor), I will wear my *moire antique* and my *ruche* of Brussels lace, and my *mantelet*, and my *chantelaine*, with all the "charms" Lord Bruin Fitzurse brought me from Dresden, and then we will take a drive in the Park, and I will leave a card at Bojannee Loll's for my next "Thursday," for really my dear "lions" are so scarce now, that even Bojannee Loll will be an acquisition: and so on.

I believe the abominable slang practice of writing P. P. C. on a card of leave-taking, and R. S. V. P. at the bottom of a letter when you wish an answer to it, is gone out of fashion, and I rejoice that it has.

Young Lord Fitzurse speaks of himself and of his aristocratic companions as "fellows" (very often pronounced "faywows"); if he is going to drive a four-horse coach down to Epsom races, he is going to "tool his drag down to the Derby." Lord Bobby Robbins's great coat, which he admires, is "down the road." An officer in the tenth hussars is "a man in the tenth;" a pretty young lady is a "neat little filly;" a vehicle which is not a drag (or dwag) is a "trap" or a "cask;" his lordship's lodgings in Jermyn Street are his "crib," his "diggings," or he "hangs out" there. His father is his "governor;" his bill-discounter a "dreadful old screw," if he refuses to do a "bit of stiff" for him. When his friend has mortgaged his estate, he pronounces it to be "dipped." Everything that pleases him is "crushing, by Jove!" everything that displeased him (from bad sherry to a writ from his father) is "infernal."

Then there is the slang of criticism. Literary, dramatic, artistic, and scientific. Such words as æsthetic, transcendental, the "harmonies," the unities, a myth; such phrases as an exquisite *morceau* on the big drum, a scholarlike rendering of John the Baptist's great toe; "keeping," "harmony," "middle distance," "aerial perspective," "delicate handling," "nervous chiaroscuro," and the like, are made use of pell-mell, without the least relation to their real meanings, their real uses, their real requirements.

And the Stage has its slang, both before and behind the curtain. Actors speak of such and such a farce being a "screamer," and such and such a tragedy being "damned" or "goosed." If an actor forgets his part while on the stage, he is said to "stick" and to "corpse" the actors who may be performing with him, by putting them out in their parts. A "part" has so many "lengths;" a piece will "run" so many nights. Belville is going in the country to "star" it. When no salaries are forthcoming on Saturday, the "ghost doesn't walk"—a benefit is a "ben," a salary a "sal;" an actor is not engaged to play tragedy or comedy, but to "do the heavy business," or "second low comedy," and when he is out of an engagement he is said to be "out of collar."

Thus through all grades and professions of life runs this omnipresent slang.

In the immense number of new words which are being continually coined and disseminated throughout our gigantic periodical press lies, I conceive, the chief difficulty of the English language to foreigners. The want of any clear and competent authority as to what words are classical and what merely slang, what obsolete and what improper, must be a source of perpetual tribulation and uncertainty to the unhappy stranger. If he is to take Johnson and Walker for standards, a walk from Charing Cross to Temple Bar, an hour at a theatre, or an evening in society, will flood his perturbed tympanum with a deluge of words concerning which Johnson and Walker are absolutely mute. How is the foreigner to make his election? Suppose the unfortunate Monsieur, or Herr, or Signor should address himself to write, as De Lolme did, a treatise on the English constitution. Suppose he were to begin a passage thus: "Though Lord Protocol was an out-and-out humbug, Sir Reddy Tapewax was not such a flat as to be taken in. He proved the gammon of Lord Protocol's move, and, though he thought him green, did him completely brown." How many young politicians would not think it beneath them to talk in this manner, yet how bitterly the foreign essayist would be ridiculed for his conversational style of composition.

The French have an Academy of Letters, and the dictionary of that Academy, published after forty years labour, nearly two centuries ago, is still the standard model of elegance and propriety in composition and conversation. The result of this has been that every work of literary excellence in France follows the phraseology, and within very little the orthography which we find